144

0-315-12458-X

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Division | Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

60369

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

Kenneth Gordon Coomber

Date of Birth — Date de naissance

Nov 29 1949

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance

Canada

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

36 Hodges Bay
Regina Sask
S4N 4R1

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset

University — Université

U of Alberta

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

M.A.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade

1982

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse

W. J Jones.

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se reserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date

Oct 12/82

Signature

Kenneth G Coomber

NL-91 (4/77)

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (r. 82/08)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ROBERT CARR, EARL OF SOMERSET

BY

© KENNETH GORDON COOMBER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1982

Microfilming

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR . . . KENNETH GORDON COOMBER

TITLE OF THESIS . . . ROBERT CARR, EARL OF SOMERSET

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED . MASTER OF ARTS

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED . 1982

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Kenneth G Coomber

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

36 Hodges Bay
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4N 4R1

DATED September 29 1982

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset" submitted by Kenneth Gordon Coomber in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in British History.

W. J. Jones
Supervisor

Nicholas Wickenden

C. G. Drummond
(External Examiner)

Dated September 29, 1982

ABSTRACT

In May of 1616 Robert Carr, a fallen favorite of King James I, was found guilty of procuring the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury. Much has been written about the personalities, plots, witchcraft, and poison involved in this deed. The interest that this dramatic case has received is responsible for keeping other aspects of Carr's career in obscurity. This is unfortunate, for Carr's time at court needs no murder to make it important. In relatively little time, and for relatively little reason, he became the most powerful and expensive subject of the king. It is Robert Carr's achievement, usage, and loss of power that form the basis of this study.

NOTE ON STYLE

In giving dates, the Julian calendar has been used, with the year beginning at 1 January. In quotations, the original spelling has been maintained.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to acknowledge the great debt I owe to Dr. W. J. Jones. His outstanding scholarship and guidance have made this work possible. I would also like to thank my parents, Richard and Marion, my sister, Linda, and my brothers, Skip and Curt for their support. I wish to dedicate whatever merit this thesis has to the golden memory of my uncle, George Coomber, whose like I shall not look upon again. On the wider stage this work is also dedicated to the happiness I have received from and the cherished memories of "Dr. Winston O'Boogie" and "Tuff Gong."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
ABSTRACT		iv
NOTE ON STYLE		v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT		vi
PREFACE		1
INTRODUCTION		5
CHAPTER		
I.	THE RISE OF ROBERT CARR	26
II.	CARR AND PERQUISITES	42
III.	CARR AND OFFICE	75
IV.	CARR AND POLICY	97
V.	CARR AND PATRONAGE	121
VI.	THE FALL OF ROBERT CARR	136
CONCLUSION		146
WORKS CITED		153

PREFACE

Robert Carr[1] had one of the most spectacular careers in seventeenth-century Britain. With the exception of the Duke of Buckingham,[2] Carr was the most rewarded member of James I's English court. During the years from 1611 until 1615 this young favorite received more direct and indirect power, positions, honors, cash, and land than any other courtier. James went so far as to share control over government with Carr. One would think that such a stellar career would be the subject of countless books and an endless line of theses; however, this has not happened. No books or theses have surfaced and only one small, unsatisfactory article directly tackles the man. This work, P. R. Seddon's "Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset,"[3] should have been titled "Robert Carr and Court Factions." While looking at Carr from the perspective of factions is valuable, factions did not bring him to the stage, keep him there, nor sweep him off. Almost one half of this article is devoted to a discussion of the Secretaryship and yet there is no discussion of Carr's wealth, and often his positions and honors are not included or they are casually mentioned.

Seddon's article apart, Robert Carr is mentioned in passing in almost all general political studies of the period. However, he is almost always cursorily dismissed as the scandal-ridden recipient of James's reckless gifts to the unworthy. It is more important to go beyond this

one dimensional picture into an investigation of his power, positions, and impact. More detailed surveys, such as the sections on Carr in D. H. Willson's King James VI and I[4] and S. R. Gardiner's History of England,[5] provide conclusions about James and do not pretend to be investigations of Carr. Works such as G. Akrigg's Jacobean Pageant,[6] which have Carr in sharper focus, are often anecdotal and of light weight. Monographs such as M. Prestwich's Cranfield,[7] L. Stone's Crisis of the Aristocracy,[8] and D. H. Willson's Privy Councillors,[9] however, are valuable because of their attention to detail. The books about Overbury's murder, including A. Amos's The Great Oyer of Poisoning,[10] E. Le Compte's The Notorious Lady Essex,[11] and B. White's Cast of Ravens[12] are aimed at a general readership. They are narrow in scope and character assessment.

Among the reasons Carr remains in partial obscurity is the lack of records. Much that passed between favorite and king was oral, secret, and unrecorded. Students of Carr have gravitated to where the records lie, in the two great scandals associated with his name. The first of these was the divorce of his paramour, Frances Howard. The second great scandal involved the murder of his former friend, Sir Thomas Overbury. Contemporary sources include collections of letters, especially those found in the Historical Manuscripts Commission[13] and such as those of Francis Bacon[14] and John Chamberlain.[15] The few surviving important letters of

Robert Carr that are printed are to be found in such volumes as the Egerton Papers,[16] Cabala,[17] and Archaeologia.[18] The bedrock of Jacobean studies such as the Venetian and Domestic volumes of the Calendar of State Papers[19] and Acts of the Privy Council[20] provide some of the richest veins of information. Contemporary tracts, such as Arthur Wilson's,[21] are also fruitful sources despite their bias.

INTRODUCTION

JAMES I AND FAVORITES

JAMES AS AN UNSUCCESSFUL RULER

Until the second half of the present century, almost all authors who have analyzed the reign of James I have categorized it as very unsuccessful. Until recently, he was almost always seen as an unsavory[22] pedant who tended to lecture Parliament and his religious "opponents," the reformed churchmen, and a narrow author whose useless political and religious works are full of strange conceits. James was also seen as a foreigner who did not understand English society and government. He was seen as too much a believer in his divine right at the expense of his subjects' rights. He was often criticized as a dupe of Spanish designs who worked against reformed religion at home as well as being opposed to such "natural allies" of his country as the Dutch. Most often the king was seen as negligent, a man obsessed with the hunt but bored with the work of kingship. James will always be known as an embarrassingly extravagant monarch who often lacked wisdom in the choice of his councillors and intimates.[23]

Contemporary sources have provided the basis for the above views. Very often, however, these histories, memoirs, and tracts are no more than polemics which were written for self-justification, for revenge, or in refutation of earlier writings. Sir Anthony Weldon, who was probably dismissed from royal service for writing a libel against the Scots, wrote perhaps the most important of these observations.[24] Arthur Wilson, a servant of the Earl of Essex, and the

writer of an important anti-Stuart tract has also had his work widely used.[25] This sampling can be added to by the writings of such authors as Francis Osborne, the parliamentarian and intimate of the Pembrokes,[26] the antiquarian and "patriot" Sir Simonds D'Ewes,[27] and Sir Edward Peyton, the "patriot" and parliamentarian whose prejudice is apparent from the title chosen for his book, The Divine Catastrophe of the Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts.[28]

Researchers, up to and including our time, have realized that these works are tainted and untrustworthy but their analyses and anecdotes continue to be used.[29] In addition to these errors of commission, there is also a pronounced error of omission. Books written in reply to the anti-Stuart works such as Sir William Sanderson's refutation of Weldon[30] or Bishop Goodman's The Court of James I,[31] have created rather less impression on the histories of the period.

This historiographical picture has started to change; as our knowledge widens and deepens, the damnation of James has become less virulent. The governing and erroneous assumption behind almost all histories of the first quarter of the seventeenth century has been that it was a vital stretch of the 'High Road' which led to the English Civil War, and to use Trevelyan's phrase the road took an "irrevocable turn."[32] The logical fallacy inherent in this

assumption is best exposed by G. R. Elton, who wrote:

> What these views have in common is a sense of inevitability. No one will deny that in the society, economy, Church and government of England there were strains (as there always are), even real conflicts of interest and opinion. The question is whether they had to lead to such results. The mistake is one of logic: to suppose that because the civil war happened therefore it was bound to happen.[33]

It seems natural that monographic studies should be the first to benefit from the sloughing off of the old framework. The explosion of myths such as James's acting in accordance with his strange notions of divine right,[34] his subjugation to Spanish design,[35] his supposed antipathy to the reformed churchmen,[36] or his attempts to rule by prerogative,[37] is dealt with in contributions to various journals and in a very good compilation volume, The Reign of James VI and I.[38] Christopher Hill's revised Century of Revolution[39] and Conrad Russell's previously mentioned The Crisis of Parliaments are just two illustrations of the new perspective of general works in the field.

Undoubtedly, one stimulus in recent years has been the work of historians of Scotland, which has created an appreciation that James VI was an outstanding sovereign of that country. However, historians of England, who have digested the import of these findings, cannot be accused of rushing to extremes of adulation. Professor Kenyon pays due

attention to the clever and perceptive aspects of James's character and acknowledges his patience in the face of almost intolerable political non-cooperation. This in no way erases the evidence that this king was often shallow, generally lazy, and in many ways thoroughly incompetent.[40] To some extent, it would seem, it is not our knowledge of James himself but our appreciation of the issues which has changed. Certainly, historians no longer indulge in a simplistic adherence to such labels as absolute, prerogative, or puritan.

Most recent monographs and surveys agree with the older studies in a more important area, that of James's judgment. His financial short-sightedness and his over-reliance on his favorite councillors, those "parasites, those he ... was ruled by ..."[41] are what historians have most often blamed for the failure of his reign.

THE SYSTEM OF FAVORITES

The term "parasites," in the above quotation, which was used by a living historian, shows how much the attitude toward favorites has changed.[42] Favoritism as a respectable or acceptable practice died in the eighteenth-century clash between democracy and monarchy. Monarchists, under siege, rejected it because it was neither a constituent part of monarchy nor was it unrelated to flagrant abuses. Those against hereditary monarchy most certainly rejected its handmaiden, favoritism. This rejection by the majority is not without its spillover into the practice of history. The negative connotations of this term, "favorite," have made its usage almost wholly pejorative, and for many it is one of the few non-grey areas of seventeenth-century history. Far too often appreciation of these friends of a monarch has not graduated much beyond their use as centerpieces in such historical romances as the works of Dumas.

"The figure of the favorite, singled out by the monarch for personal reasons, was a common enough phenomenon in late Medieval and Renaissance monarchy. Such a person could be of major political importance or of none at all."[43] Henry VIII, for example, had Charles Brandon, whom he loaded with honors and gifts but who rarely carried any weight in policy making and perhaps not even in the distribution of patronage. Edward VI was too young for such a connection, though there was doubtless a momentary fear that his disreputable and doomed younger uncle, Tom Seymour, was

aspiring to some such place. Mary would have liked to rely upon her husband, but during their brief marriage he was for too long distinguished by his absence.

It was always understood that a "personal monarch" would have personal friends, that overlapping or parallel to official appointments, personal preference would determine a sovereign's choice of intimates. Problems arose if but one of the latter appeared not merely to dominate but threatened to overshadow the inner circle of political advice. In 1560, the second year of young Elizabeth's reign, there was a brief moment when this possibility arose. Dudley seemed to have commandeered the queen's affections, his prime place being "looked upon with wary acceptance as a fact of the political universe."[44] Elizabeth restrained herself, however, and thereafter, until the last years of her reign, endeavored to maintain a broadly-based political structure, comprising many factions and interests. When, in the course of events, domination was achieved by one man, Robert Cecil, he certainly could not be described as either a favorite or an intimate of the queen.

Carr and Villiers, the two great favorites of James, have no parallel in Tudor history.[45] They were to become much more than boon companions, faction heads, and expensive playthings. Carr, and later Villiers, received position after position and power upon power. There was much more to this than the aggrandizement of an individual; it was a

profoundly new approach to government as a whole. This was the experiment, called "bedchamber government," whereby James would rule as well as reign. Bedchamber government was the most radical attempt at royal control since Henry VII, with much more success, had followed such a course. The king was to be a participant and overseer while Carr and Villiers were allowed a role much like the one that Salisbury had enjoyed. James felt that his talent and active participation, coupled with a lieutenant who had been personally chosen, personally tutored, and personally directed for years would bring better government and one more in keeping with royal wishes. Even so the king, like his predecessor, continued to sponsor more than one political interest.[46] Sometimes, as between 1618 and 1621, this led to rival foreign policies so contradictory that foreign diplomats and subsequent historians have reason to question the king's competence. In the last resort, however, his grasp only faltered when his favorite allied with the heir to the throne.

James Stuart raised royal favoritism to its highest point in the early modern period and he did so in part because of personal loneliness. Early in his life as sovereign of Scotland, James's person was used as a political shuttlecock and this at a time, as he said in a moment of self-pity, when he was "without mudder or fadder." Such loneliness was not to be dissipated by marriage. The love

he imagined for Anne of Denmark,[47] which neither witchcraft nor the North Seas in winter could stop, quickly evaporated. With the exception of his daughter Elizabeth, who left for the Palatinate in 1613, small solace was to be gained from the offspring of his marriage. Henry, the aggressive and over-confident elder son, was very quick to set himself up as a reversionary interest,[48] while Charles, the younger son, was overly shy and introspective.

James's interest in favorites may have had less to do with his unhappy family life than the much debated but insoluble question of the king's sexual preference. James's less than subtle displays of affection for his favorites, in public, led many of his contemporaries to believe that his affairs were physically consummated in private. If James was, in fact, homosexual, he was very circumspect since no incontrovertible evidence has survived to clarify this point.

However, James cared for the looks of his young friends. All favorites were young men when they came to the attention of the king. The most important feature of Carr's appeal lay in his beauty. He was described at this time by Thomas Howard, who said that "the ladies too are not behind hand in their admiration; for I tell you, good knight, this fellow is straight-limbed, well-favored, strong-shouldered and smooth-faced."[49]

The position of favorite was, of course, extremely

coveted; its enormous power both at the local and central levels, the wealth, prestige, and honors involved, made this the seventeenth-century equivalent of a lottery win. The Countess of Suffolk even sought out young men "who[m] she daily curled, and perfumed their breaths"[50] to present to the king. There were literally dozens of young men who felt themselves to be rising favorites. Most of these were nine-day wonders, victims of a king who cast his net wide. In a society that was noteworthy for its hierarchical structure, it is interesting that three of the four most important, Villiers, Carr, and Hay, were of gentry origin while one, Philip Herbert, was the younger son of a peer.[51]

Carr's national origin was very much more important to his career than his class origin. The ancient hatred between the English and the Scots was still very much alive in James's reign. The king himself came up against the hatred borne by the English for the Scots.[52] Incidents such as a race at Croydon, in 1612, where only by the narrowest of margins was a huge pitched battle between the two groups avoided, show how much tension and hatred existed. Fights between the Scots and the English also broke out in Bohemia at Elizabeth's court in 1613.[53] The English outdid themselves with the Scots when they realized that the king had long conceived the "perfect union" of the two kingdoms to be the project by which his reign should be remembered. This advanced and rational project by which, as the king said, "he would be

married to one wife instead of two," was to be guided by Francis Bacon, partly because the principal advisers of James were at the best cool towards the idea.[54] The numbers and ferocity of the opposition[55] and the slowness in ironing out legitimate questions[56] gradually ground the project to a halt. When the king was sounding Carr out and teaching him Latin, Thomas Howard said that "some one should teach him English too; for, as he is a Scotish lad, he hath much need of a better language."[57] Only David Mathew mentions how much Carr's nationality hurt his career.[58]

The usual course of James's affairs started with him singling out a young man, making his interest known, and schooling the potential favorite. The king's intellectual leanings, which were often expressed in a pedantic fashion, found an outlet here with people such as Carr and Villiers. Beyond this stage and provided he met James's criteria, the heights to which a favorite rose were primarily dependant on his ambitions and ability. Carr and Villiers rose swiftly in the court and government while James Hay left his mark in the acquisition and spending of money and as an ambassador.

HAY AS AN EXAMPLE

James Hay was the product of a thorough education, years spent in France, and a diplomatic, pleasing personality. The king was interested in this cultured young man and brought him to England in 1603.[59] For a brief time his analysis of foreign affairs was vying with Salisbury's as the basis of policy.[60] Despite such infrequent attempts, Hay was to serve a long apprenticeship before he was entrusted with a position of importance. Indeed Hay's failure to become established as the king's principal intimate may be the cause, rather than the consequence, of the fact that he was well-liked in all quarters despite his being a Scot.[61] In 1616, he was sent to France to negotiate a marriage for Prince Charles. Two years later, he was in Bohemia mediating in the troubles in which the Count Palatine, James's son-in-law, had entangled himself with the Habsburgs. Hay quickly saw that the catholic powers wanted the English to arbitrate the dispute, thus neutralizing a potential enemy.

Hay's lack of political preferment was matched by the lack of court position which was offered to him. Hay was well-known as a fashion-plate, a fact which helps to account for his appointment to the lucrative post of Mastership of the Wardrobe. This, his only court appointment of note, he handled in such a profligate fashion that he had to be bought out. Hay spent an average of £42,000 a year[62] as Master while the Elizabethan average was under £10,000.[63] This enormous discrepancy caused D. H. Willson to dub Hay

"the wastrel Master of the wardrobe."[64] A parallel to such spending can be found on his embassies abroad, one of which cost £26,000, an outrageous figure which led Lawrence Stone to comment that "making peace was almost as expensive as waging war."[65] In addition to the above bounty and ready cash such as the £10,000 wedding gift from the king, Hay had his wealth added to by grants of crown land, concealed lands, fines from recusants, and the export of duty free cloth. Twice, Hay took advantage of that great financial boon, marriage into a wealthy family. The only glimmer of self-reliance in this picture was his investment in four trading companies and his directorship of the Virginia Company.[66] Despite his great financial gains, he lived close to the brink of poverty as befits one whose motto was, "Spend and God will send."[67] Hay's lifestyle and proximity to English treasure saddled James with the reputation of giving too much to the unworthy. Hay's career shows that a favorite did not have to provide valuable service in exchange for rich reward. It also shows that favorites were judged according to the merit of their individual careers.

INTRODUCTION - FOOTNOTES

[1]Robert Carr lived from c. 1587 to 1645.

[2]George Villiers (1592-1628). He was Carr's successor as favorite and his career was even more important than Carr's.

[3]P. R. Seddon, "Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset," Renaissance and Modern Studies, 14 (1970), pp. 48-68.

[4]D. H. Willson, King James VI and I (London, 1956).

[5]S. R. Gardiner, History of England from the Accession of James to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-42, ii, (London, 1907).

[6]G. P. V. Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant or the Court of King James I (Cambridge, Mass., 1962).

[7]M. Prestwich, Cranfield, Politics and Profits Under the Early Stuarts (Oxford, 1966).

[8]L. Stone, The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641 (Oxford, 1965).

[9]D. H. Willson, The Privy Councillors in the House of Commons, 1604-1629 (New York, 1971).

[10]A. Amos, The Great Oyer of Poisoning (London, 1846).

[11]E. Le Compte, The Notorious Lady Essex (New York, 1969).

[12]B. White, Cast of Ravens, The Strange Case of Sir Thomas Overbury (New York, 1965).

[13]Historical Manuscripts Commission. Especially important are the Hatfield, Portland, Downshire, and Marr and Kellie volumes.

[14]J. Spedding, ed., The Letters and The Life of Francis Bacon, iv, v (London, 1869).

[15]N. McClure, ed., The Letters of John Chamberlain, 2 vols., (Philadelphia, 1939).

[16]J. Collier, ed., The Egerton Papers, A Collection of Public and Private Documents (London, 1840).

[17]Cabala, Mysteries of State, in Letters of the Great Ministers of K. James and K. Charles. Faithfully collected by a Noble Hand (London, 1654).

[18]Archaeologia: or Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to Antiquity, xli, xvii (London).

[19]Calendar of State Papers.

[20]Acts of the Privy Council, xxxiii, xxxiv.

[21]A. Wilson, The History of Great Britain, Being the Life and Reign of James I (London, 1653).

[22]Authors such as D. H. Willson in his King James VI and I, and S. R. Gardiner in the History of England, appear to have had a personal dislike for James.

[23]All authors seem to agree on this point.

[24]Sir Anthony Weldon, The Court and Character of King James (London, 1650).

[25]Wilson, History.

[26]F. Osborne, Traditionall Memoyres on the Raigne of King James I (London, 1658).

[27]S. D'Ewes, Autobiography and Correspondence, J. Halliwell ed., (London, 1845).

[28]Sir Edward Peyton, The Divine Catastrophe of the Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts (London, 1652).

[29]James's unrealistic hatred of the naked sword is such an idea that has continued down through the ages.

[30]W. Sanderson, A Compleat History of the Lives and Reigns of Mary Queen of Scotland, and of her Son and Successor, James the Sixth, King of Scotland (London, 1656).

[31]Godfrey Goodman, The Court of King James the First (2 vols., J. S. Brewer, ed., (London, 1839).

[32]G. Trevelyan, England Under the Stuarts (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1960), p. 72.

[33]G. R. Elton, "A High Road to Civil War?" in From the Renaissance to the Counter-Reformation: Essays in Honor of Garrett Mattingly, Charles H. Carter, ed., (New York, 1965), p. 327.

[34]M. Judson, The Crisis of the Constitution, (New Brunswick, N.J., 1949), pp. 17-34. An article treating the whole subject of how James has been dealt with is M. Schwarz, "James I and the Historians: Toward a Reconsideration," Journal of British Studies 13-14 (1973-1975), pp. 114-134.

[35]C. H. Carter, The Secret Diplomacy of the Hapsburgs, 1598-1625 (London, 1964), pp. 47-48. Carter points out the threat from France hence the need for peace with Spain.

[36]M. Curtis, "Hampton Court Conference and its Aftermath," History 45-46 (1960-1961), pp. 1-12.

[37]W. J. Jones, "The Crown and the Courts in England 1603-1625," The Reign of James VI and I, A. G. R. Smith, ed., (London, 1973), pp. 177-194.

[38]A. G. R. Smith, ed., The Reign of James VI and I (London, 1973).

[39]C. Hill, The Century of Revolution, revised edition (Toronto, 1981).

[40]J. P. Kenyon, Stuart England (London, 1978), pp. 7-74, and cf. his comments on available studies of James, pp. 360-61. A similar, if more reluctant approach, is provided by the most recent survey of the period: B. Coward, The Stuart Age. A History of England, 1603-1714 (London, 1980), pp. 104-106.

[41]M. Prestwich, "English Politics and Administration 1603-1625," The Reign of James VI and I, A. G. R. Smith, ed., (London, 1973), p. 159.

[42]The closest that can be seen to an attack on favoritism, in this period, is an attack on continual favor towards one person. Calvert, a clerk of the Council, writing to William Trumbull, the English Resident in Brussels, called continual favor the "misery of our age." H.M.C. Downshire, iii, p. 344.

[43]Wallace MacCaffrey, The Shaping of the Elizabethan Regime. Elizabethan Politics, 1558-1572 (London, 1969), p. 39.

[44]Ibid., p. 39.

[45]It is probable that one would have to go back to the reign of Edward II (1307-1327) to find a time when favorites were given as much power as James gave Carr and Villiers.

[46]Cf. generally, Roy E. Schreiber, The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton, 1589-1635 (London, 1981).

[47]Anne was rather childish and not at all to the king's liking. Her dubious nature can be seen by the fact that no one could get to the bottom of her religious convictions, if indeed she had any. A. Loomie, "King James I's Catholic Consort," Huntington Library Quarterly 34 (1970-71), pp. 303-316.

[48]J. Williamson, The Myth of the Conqueror, Prince Henry Stuart: A Study of 17th Century Personation (New York, 1978), pp. 129-153. Akrigg says that James was complaining that Henry wanted to bury him before he was dead. This may be apocryphal but it does give the flavor of the relationship. Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, p. 133.

[49]Thomas Howard in L. Aikin, Memoirs of the Court of James the First, i (London, 1823), p. 239. Thomas Howard is identified by Aikin as the son of Suffolk which would make him the future brother-in-law of Carr. It is interesting that this account also says Carr was perceived as leering on men's wives.

[50]Weldon in R. Ashton, ed., James I (London, 1969), p. 118.

[51]DNB.

[52]The only piece of legislation dear to James's heart which the Commons obstructed was the union with Scotland. Conrad Russell, "Parliamentary History in Perspective, 1604-1629," History 61 (1976), p. 5. Russell also says that James's worst disadvantage was that he was a Scot. Russell, Crisis of Parliaments, p. 258. See also C. V. Wedgwood, Truth and Opinion (London, 1960), pp. 157, et passim.

[53]John Nichols, The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, 4 vols., (1828; reprint ed., New York: Burt Franklin) ii, p. 672.

[54]W. Notestein, The House of Commons 1604-1610 (London, 1971), pp. 248-249.

[55]T. Rabb, "Sir Edwin Sandys and the Parliament of 1604," American Historical Review 69 (1964), pp. 464-470.

[56]These included the legal position of the pre- and post-nati.

[57]Aikin, Memoirs, p. 329.

[58]D. Mathew, The Jacobean Age (London, 1938), p. 112.

[59]The year of his birth is uncertain but he was created Earl of Carlisle in 1622 and died in 1636.

[60]Schreiber, Naunton, p. 24.

[61]C.S.P. Dom., 1603-1610, p. 651. December 1610.

[62]Prestwich, Cranfield, pp. 228-230.

[63]R. H. Tawney, Business and Politics Under James I (Cambridge, 1958), p. 152.

[64]Willson, James I, p. 388.

[65]Stone, Crisis, p. 462.

[66]T. K. Rabb, Enterprise and Empire (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1967), p. 311.

[67]M. Prestwich, "English Politics and Administration," p. 145.

CHAPTER I

THE RISE OF ROBERT CARR

ANTECEDENTS

The Carr (Kerr or Ker, as the Scottish spelling has it) family of southern Scotland are of ancient Anglo-Saxon origin. An early mention of a Ker in this part of Scotland comes from the twelfth century when one Johnes Ker, described as "a uenator aput swhynhope" or hunter, is cited as a witness to a boundary in Peebleshire.[1] Robert's branch of the Kers, the Lothian line, descended from one Ralph Ker who settled in Teviotdale about 1350. The seventh to fall heir to Ralph was Thomas, who sat in the 1476 Scottish Parliament. This Thomas, Robert's great-great grandfather, gave the line its greatest impetus by clearing space in the Jedburgh forest near Ferniehurst for a castle. This stronghold increased the power and prestige of the owner and quite naturally solidified the nomenclature of the branch as the Kers of Ferniehurst. Robert's father, Sir Thomas, played a large part in the complex pattern of alliances, vendettas, and thefts that made up border life.[2] He was named Keeper of Leddesdale and Warden of the Middlemarch in 1584. Within a year of his appointment he was dismissed for unknown reasons and warded in the castle of Doune.[3] The sway he held in the border area can be seen by the fact that at one point he had marched at the head of three thousand men to sack Jedburgh.[4] Thomas was a strong supporter of James's mother, Mary Queen of Scots. Such support was appreciated and long remembered by James.[5]

Thomas fathered two families, the first by Janet, the

daughter and heir of Sir William Kirkaldy of Grange. The offspring were Andrew, Janet, and Margaret. Thomas's second match was with another Janet, a sister of Sir Walter Scott of Buccleuch. The offspring of this union were James of Crailing, Thomas, Robert, and a younger sister who married John, Lord Balgy.

There is much we should like to know about the Carr family in the years surrounding Robert's birth. We do not even know the year in which he was born. Beatrice White gives 1587[6] as the year but since Thomas died in March 1586, her dating may be wrong. Even more enigmatic than the year of the birth is the place where this occurred. Thomas Fuller said that he was born in the city of York:

> Thomas Carr, his father, laird of Furnihurst, a man of great lands and power in the south of Scotland was very active for Mary Queen of Scots; and on that account forced to fly his land, and come to York. Now although he had been a great inroader of England, yet for some secret reason of state, here he was permitted safe shelter, during which time Robert his son was born.[7]

This information, which is impossible to prove or disprove, has the ring of authenticity about it and if true would explain a good deal about the ease with which Robert Carr became the first Scottish peer to sit in the House of Lords.

Robert himself seems to have written little about his early years. Later authors, supposing that Robert grew up in the fractious border lands, have turned their imaginations to his youth. White says that he was a "raw Scottish

lad without talent or education,"[8] a picture that is fleshed out by Le Compte, who says that Thomas Overbury, who had letters of introduction to the Ferniehursts, "encountered the younger son, [Robert] truly a fourteen-year-old bumpkin."[9] But we have the word of the king that Carr was raised at court and not at Ferniehurst. In a letter to Salisbury, dated 23 November 1608, James wrote "I must confess that he [Robert] is the only young man, whom as I brought with me and broughtup as a child, that was now left unprovided for I mean according to that rank whereunto I have promoted him."[10] By taking him into his court, James was rewarding a follower of his mother, and fulfilling the customary arrangement whereby a young man of gentle breeding could exchange service for education, polish, and connections.

Carr, as James mentioned to Salisbury, followed the king south in 1603. Legend has it that the change to English court custom made Carr's position redundant and so he was free to travel to the continent. This travel, which seems to have been centered on France, was quite in keeping with expectations of such young men, for this was an age when the Grand Tour was in vogue. A poem which starts:

> Let any poor lad that is handsome and young
> with Parle vous France, and a voice for a song,[11]

gives us our only hint about his time spent abroad, that he learned French.

Given James's habit of rewarding supporters of his

mother and the fact that Carr was raised at the Scottish court, the young man could have reasonably expected a life free from want. A twist of fate in the form of a riding injury, however, allowed Carr to try for greater things.

FIRST PROMOTION, 1607

PLATEAU

ACCUMULATION OF BENEFITS, 1611-1615

Robert Carr's fall from his horse at a tournament in front of James in March 1607, started him on the road to fame and fortune. This fall caused such a great stir that it was commented on by a number of his contemporaries. Compared with other affairs such as this, the commentary is very detailed. We are told that Carr, who had suffered a broken leg, was taken to Master Rider's House in the village of Charing Cross and the king, greatly desiring to rush to the aid of the young man, could hardly wait for the tilt to end.[12] That Carr was injured appealed to the king's solicitous nature on such occasions, and to be fair to him, the royal physician, Mayerne, who was immediately put on the case, was reputed to be the best in Europe.

During Carr's convalescence, all were prohibited from visiting him. James knew that the initial interest he had shown would cause the court to beat a deep path to the young man's door. Courtiers sought to establish links with those people that the king showed interest in. Knowing a contact who was close to the sovereign could help a great deal with a courtier's suits. The king sheltered Carr from the powerful, would-be powerful, and merely curious so they would not "retard his recovery by spending his spirits."[13]

Carr was given a knighthood less than ten months after the tilt at which he broke his leg.[14] This knighthood was not the only one that week; it was the fifth in four days.[15] The honor, which was bestowed on or near Christmas Eve in 1607, must partially be seen as an inexpensive Christmas present from a sovereign whose progress south in 1603 showed that James did not intend, like his predecessor, to husband such favors. In addition to the knighthood, Carr also received a position at court. John Chamberlain wrote on December 30 that "Sir Robert Carr is lately sworne gentleman of the bedchamber."[16] Despite the king's initial interest and the young man's acquisition of a knighthood and court position, a plateau had been reached. One of the most astonishing features of Carr's brilliant eight-year career is that for almost four years after he was knighted he was given no further honors.

Perhaps Carr was careful not to solicit too many honors. Despite what he later said about being "a Peere of this kingdome, and naturalized as well by affection and meritt towards it as by lawe," he knew he had to be circumspect because he was regarded as a foreign interloper. He admitted his caution and his hesitancy to offend the English nobility by writing "your Lordship knowes how carefull I have beene to preserve the nobility here, rather than invade the right of any...."[17] This hiatus in honors for Carr coincided with the lull in the king's numerous bestowals of

knighthoods and peerages after the beginning of his reign and before the sale of many titles after 1615.

Behind James's change was the Earl of Salisbury, who for a time successfully curbed the king's penchant for giving lavish gifts and frequent honors. Salisbury wanted to keep the favorite's fortunes at a stand for more reasons than to save honors and money. Carr had joined the "patriots," a loose amalgamation of courtiers who wanted to take over Salisbury's power and positions as well as to replace his policies.[18]

When Salisbury's hold on the king's grace declined early in 1611, Carr's career burst forth in a spectacular way. In contrast to the past four years, the next four were to be adorned by an astonishing list of honors and positions.

On 25 March 1611 Robert Carr was created Viscount Rochester, at Whitehall.[19] The new Viscount was further honored, on 24 April of the same year, when he was included in the ranks of the Order of the Garter.[20] Others, such as the powerful community of lawyers, acknowledged that his star was rising. In October 1611, he was admitted to the Middle Temple.[21]

The very magnitude of Carr's eminence after 1612 was enough to cause much speculation about honors that people thought were about to go to him. In June 1612 Chamberlain sent news to Dudley Carleton that Carr wanted the Earldom

of Devonshire.[22] Carr's acquisition of the Westmoreland lands led many in October 1613 to believe that he would be given that Earldom.[23] Over a year later, and only weeks before his creation as Earl of Somerset, there was still talk that he might be given other Earldoms such as Albemarle or Warren.[24] On 4 November 1613 Robert Carr was given the barony of Brancepeth[25] and Earldom of Somerset. The official reasons given included his worth and nobility; however, the most important reason was that within two months he was to marry Frances Howard and it would have been unthinkable to have her descend.[26]

Many historians erroneously assume that since Carr married a Howard, this cemented an alliance between an inferior favorite and a superior, united Howard faction. Such a notion would have surprised the principals and their contemporaries.[27] The Howards were not an indivisable faction but two main groups headed by Northampton, the bride's great uncle, and Suffolk, her father. Carr was on such bad terms with the Suffolk branch that some said the marriage might have been set afoot to end the animosity between Suffolk and Carr, "thereby to reconcile him and the House of Howard together, who are now far enough asunder."[28] The marriage eventually did make Suffolk more powerful[29] but a more immediate repercussion was a new dance of offices for Carr, the Howards and the court in general.

The English had greater cause for worry than the amount

of money and honors which had gone Carr's way in the years from 1610 to 1613. While members of the aristocracy may have felt insulted at the young man's steady rise, many more had greater cause for concern since between the stages of becoming Viscount and becoming an Earl, Carr was also made a member of the Privy Council. In addition he was made a member of the Scottish Privy Council in October 1613. Carr was James's acting Secretary of State from July 1612 until March 1614. He was provisional Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports from July 1614 until July 1615 and acting Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal from June 1614 until November 1615. In 1614 he was given his last position, Lord Lieutenant of Durham. Robert Carr, unlike his successor George Villiers,[30] never reached the highest rungs on the ladder of honors.[31]

More important than honors and positions was the tremendous power he came to hold over appointments, royal bounty, and policy. Many of the great figures of his day including Francis Bacon, Thomas Lake,[32] and Lionel Cranfield[33] benefited from Carr's help and protection. At first, Carr was a member of the "patriot," pro-Parliament, anti-catholic group which included Pembroke[34] and Abbot.[35] Late in 1613 the favorite trimmed his sails to suit the royal winds and in the process became so preeminent that it was quickly evident that the king decided everything with Carr. It was said, in bitterness, that "the Lords can scarce have a smile within him."[36] However, Carr's successor,

George Villiers, came much closer to securing the destruction of opposing groups and the fashioning of a court almost solely dependent upon himself.

CHAPTER I - FOOTNOTES

[1]C. Ewen, A History of Surnames of the British Isles (London, 1931), p. 107.

[2]See in general G. Watson, The Border Reivers (London, 1974).

[3]T. Rae, The Administration of the Scottish Frontier, 1513-1603 (Edinburgh, 1966), p. 240.

[4]G. M. Fraser, The Steel Bonnets (London, 1974), p. 152.

[5]M. Lee Jr., "James VI's Government of Scotland after 1603," Scottish Historical Review 55 (April 1976), p. 44. The high value James placed on loyalty to his mother seems to have gone unnoticed in the case of Carr. When Carr was in the Tower he made much of this connection and neglected to note his fall from the horse, see p. 27. "And I was even the Son of a Father, whose services are registered in the first honours and impressions I took of your Majesties favour, and laid thereas a foundation stone of that building." Cabala, p. 4.

[6]White, Cast of Ravens, p. 7.

[7]T. Fuller, The Worthies of England (London, 1952), p. 671.

[8]White, Cast of Ravens, p. 7.

[9]E. Le Comte, The Notorious Lady Essex, p. 26.

[10]H. M. C. Hatfield, XX, pp. 269-270.

[11]A. Ewald, Stories from the State Papers (Boston, 1882), p. 44.

[12]Weldon in G. B. Harrison, A Second Jacobean Journal (London, 1958), p. 19.

[13]Ibid., p. 24.

[14]S. R. Gardiner in DNB says this was on 23 December 1607. Nichols's Progresses, ii, p. 161 gives the date December 24. Cokayne's Complete Peerage p. 66 gives both dates, G. E. Cokayne, Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, 12 vols. (London, 1887-98), xii, p. 66. Shaw's list of Knights Bachelors gives 23 (24) December. W. Shaw, The Knights of England, 2 vols., ii (Baltimore, 1971), p. 144.

[15]Nichols, Progresses, ii, p. 161.

[16]Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 249.

[17]Egerton Papers, p. 455.

[18]It was Salisbury who proposed that Carr should get Raleigh's Sherborne Manor. This proposal hit two opponents with one bolt. As we shall see, this damaged Carr's reputation and stripped Raleigh of a loved and valuable asset. See below pp. 44-46.

[19]Nichols, Progresses, p. 415.

[20]Shaw, Knights, i, p. 30.

[21]"The houses were always eager to enroll courtiers and peers as honorary members, setting up their arms in chapel or hall as visible evidence of the society's honorable connections. The motive was probably less to secure additional friends than to maintain an aristocratic image." W. Prest, The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts, 1590-1640 (Aylesbury, 1972), pp. 224-225.

[22]Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 360.

[23]H.M.C. Downshire, iv, p. 229.

[24]Ibid., p. 229.

[25]This corrected an oversight; he should have obtained it when he received his knighthood. Nichols, Progresses, i, p. 702.

[26]The marriage took place on 26 December 1613 at the Chapel Royal.

[27]It was said of Carr that he has, "swallowed up the House with which he is matched." H.M.C. Portland, ix, p. 28.

[28]Uncited in Nichols, Progresses, ii, pp. 670-671.

[29]H.M.C. Downshire, iv, p. 316, 22 February 1614.

[30]Villiers was created Duke of Buckingham 18 May 1623, S. R. Gardiner in DNB. Lennox was the only Duke in the three kingdoms until Buckingham.

[31]It was rumored at one point that Carr was about to get the title Marquis of Orkney in Scotland but this did not materialize. H.M.C. Downshire, iv, p. 242.

[32]Lake (c. 1567-1630) was Latin Secretary to James. In 1616 he became Secretary of State.

[33]Cranfield (1575-1645) became Treasurer in 1621.

[34]William Herbert (1584-1650). He was a nephew of Sir Philip Sidney and a patron of the arts. He was to quarrel with Robert Carr over position and policy. Pembroke was appointed Lord Chamberlain when Carr was disgraced.

[35]George Abbot (1562-1633) became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1611. He was very opposed to Frances Howard's divorce and like Pembroke was an early supporter of George Villiers.

[36]Wilson, History, p. 55.

CHAPTER II

CARR AND PERQUISITES

THE GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL PROBLEM

James I's most pressing problem, like that of his predecessor Elizabeth, was financial. There was a general idea that the sovereign, like a subject, was "to live of his own," that is, from his or her lands, revenues, and rights. "Evident and urgent" needs were to be laid before Parliament which would grant taxes if they agreed on the need and felt it was for the common good of the realm. "Evident and urgent" need almost always meant war, rebellion, or such an occurrence as a coronation.[1] Early modern price rises and unusual expenses, such as the duplication of royal households for the queen and Prince Henry, helped to cause a gulf between the theory of "living of one's own" and the practice. The theory was antiquated: "of all aspects of early Stuart government, the system of public finance remained most evidently medieval in both its mechanism and outlook."[2]

The greatest contradiction in the situation was that since the time of Henry VII the real value of lands directly in the crown's hands, or leased by it, had dwindled, whereas the costs of government had increased. Not only were the English people paying less in real value than they had in the past as taxes, they were also paying less than their continental counterparts. The political nation, those inside the "pale" of power, were underassessed with reference to their ability to pay and they often managed to escape payment altogether. James's first Parliament, which met

in five sessions between 1604 and 1610 was willing to help, and he was also aided by popular emotion at discovery of the Gunpowder Plot. Nonetheless, peace came with his accession and he could not advance war as evident grounds for extra-ordinary supply.

Elizabeth had managed to maintain a regular surplus on her ordinary account but the new king had a blindness about money. James was a prisoner of his poverty-striken past and his vacillating personality. While king in Scotland, he must have felt himself poor in comparison to the English sovereign.

Anne's and James's attitude to what they thought would be the land of milk and honey can be seen from Anne, who before leaving Scotland gave away all her jewels, dresses, hangings, and everything she had. James spent £30,000 on coronation sundries while the childbeds for Lady Mary and Lady Sophia were twice that amount. The king's jewels in one year alone cost £47,000.[3] Many purchases for himself and his family would in part remain as royal treasure. Such was not the case with his openhanded acquiescence to the hordes of suppliants, "A paper drawn up in 1610 fixes the King's rewards and gifts to 'Scottishmen' since his accession at £10,614 in pensions annually, £88,280 in ready money, and £133,100 in old debts."[4] S. R. Gardiner, analyzing the long term political cost of such profligacy, wrote that "nothing, made James so unpopular as the wealth which he showered

down upon the Scotch courtiers."[5]

Sir Julius Caesar computed the debt left by Elizabeth at £422,749.[6] In May of 1608 when Salisbury was made Lord Treasurer the debt stood at £597,337 and the entire year's estimated expenditure had already been exceeded by £78,433.[7] Despite Salisbury's vigorous retrenchment and painstaking efforts, including the unrealized Great Contract of 1610 whereby the crown would surrender certain feudal rights for a lump sum of £600,000 to pay debts and £200,000 per annum, little in fact changed.[8] At Salisbury's death in 1612, the debt stood at £500,000 and expenses exceed income by £160,000 a year.[9]

Despite some perceptive thoughts about absolute power, James never seems to have fully appreciated the role of money. James promised on more than one occasion to mend his spendthrift ways, going so far as to abide by a list of suits grantable and not grantable that was drawn up by Salisbury. His desire to please and his weakness doomed such attempts. When, on occasion, he did take a personal interest in these matters his efforts may have been misplaced. "James interested himself in the number of men still in the garrison at Berwick, and under the spur of his zeal for economy a few hundred pounds were saved by the retirement of one hundred of them on half pay, but at the same moment the new bridge at Berwick took £8,000 from the treasury."[10]

CARR'S SOURCES OF WEALTH

FINANCIAL GAINS

Had James's government been financially buoyant, Carr's gains would have been an extremely surprising distortion in the financial affairs of the kingdom, but the constant financial foundering of the government made such gains by a mere subject seem grotesque.

Robert Carr for years was to play the leading role as recipient of royal extravagance. It was, of course, in the favorite's interest to have such an openhanded sovereign, for all of his wealth stemmed directly or indirectly from his relationship with the king. Wealth, direct and indirect, came in such forms as cash, land, monopolies, allowances, bribes, and gifts from the king and interested parties.[11] The latter, the proceeds from suitors seeking to ingratiate themselves with the favorite and thus secure his recommendation, must have been immense, but the annual value is impossible to compute. It would include gifts, as at Christmas, plus food and cash, sometimes delivered to Carr's servants. Overall, the king gave to Carr such an amount of money that on one occasion the favorite, flush with royal cash, actually lent money to a destitute James.[12]

It seems natural that one of the first mentions of Carr, after his recovery from his broken leg, should deal with fashion, for the court had a positive mania about the continental styles which flooded into London. Carr had an eye to his appearance and no doubt appeared rather fashionable

after his sojourn on the continent. In any case, by the autumn of 1607 he is reported to have changed "his tailors and tiremen many times, and all to please the prince, who ... wisheth for change every day."[13] James too was interested in fashion and from 1608 to 1613 he bought, "a new suit every ten days, a new pair of stockings, boots, and garters every four or five days, and a new pair of gloves every day."[14] Thomas Howard said suitors should speak with Carr about the king's taste because he "knoweth his tastes and what pleaseth."[15]

Carr's expenses for clothes and much else were to be met by the generous James. A document in the State Papers says Carr was given a "yearly rent charge of £600 to be paid to him for fifteen years by John Warner and three others in consideration of a grant to them of certain unspecified arrears due to the Crown."[16] Six months after this windfall, he received a very fashionable piece of jewelry, a personal memento from the king. The State Papers describe the gift and the circumstances surrounding it by listing a "Warrant to pay Henryck Van Hulfen, for a tablet of gold set with diamonds, and the King's Picture, given by the King to Robert Carr...."[17]

The cash that flowed from the crown to Carr was enormous but to the credit of the king, or more likely Salisbury, during the initial years of favoritism, restraint was shown. In 1607 Carr was allowed to make what profit he

could of Edward Sayer, a York recusant.[18] A pension of £800[19] came to him in the following year, 1608. The foregoing were rather minor gains compared to what the future held. After the year 1610 this rivulet of money became a river.

The reason behind this increase is to be found in what proved to be the eclipse of Salisbury and the Great Contract, his plan to get the government out of its deep financial waters. This plan and the Parliament where it was introduced failed. Angry at the uncooperative parliamentarians and the anti-Scots line they had taken, the king turned his back on such plans for reconstruction and on his own half-hearted attempts at austerity.[20]

In the year 1610, Carr was given a £20,000 composition for the loss of Sherborne manor in Dorset[21] as well as £500 for the loss of its rents.[22] Starting in February of the next year, the tempo of the flow actually increased when £40,000 was dispersed among the Scots of the bedchamber, chief of whom was Robert Carr.[23] Lawerence Stone has described the year 1611, when £43,600 was given[24] to peers, as the annus mirabilis for cash giveaways. After having been made a Viscount early in that year the favorite was given a free gift of £5,000,[25] and an order from a few months later was sent out to pay £8,000 to Carr which he had been given by the king.[26]

While 1611 may have been a miracle year for the court

as a whole, that year and 1612, when Carr was given £12,000[27] in one disbursement alone, were both exceeded by the windfall of 1613. The money Carr got in this year included a free gift of £15,500,[28] plus £2,000 interest for money which he had advanced for Raby manor in Durham.[29] John Chamberlain, the letter writer and observer, wrote of Carr and cash in October 1613, "either his commings in are very great, or els he is a goode husband and carefull keper, for yt is observed that within this twelvemoneth he hath made shew of above £90,000...."[30] Carr's wealth and the crown's poverty led to a ridiculous scene in April 1613, when the favorite helped the financially embarrassed king with a cash loan of £25,000.[31] This contribution does not seem to have been one of the periodic requests by James for money from the dependent and wealthy since Carr on one such occasion gave only £200.[32] This bizarre episode of the loan depicts an expensive foreign favorite, chaos in royal finances, and a king out of control.

Years later, in a letter to King Charles, Carr denied that he was the great recipient of the give-aways, and even tried to make himself out to have been a reformer:

> All suites of benefit and whatsoever else was to be given, had been disposed of long before; the Lands of the Crowne had bene aliend and wasted by gifts, but a great deale more by exchanges and sales; wherefore instead of making suites for myself and others I found cause to intreate that his Majestie would think of the meanes how his owne estate might be repaired, and to stay his hand awhile from giving....

Carr continued in this self-serving and inaccurate fashion by saying:

> I never had of gift from the King his Majesties father any eyther of his Crowne Land or Customs, nor yet any thing whereby eyther himselfe, or the publicke, or any other person sustained losse. As for suites, I never made any to him for my selfe, but I have refused and returned againe much of that he had given me, and withall I thinke I may say that whatsoever I had received at any time of his gyft, it eyther tooke nothing from himselfe or it brought ever an increase with it of so much more to him and to the Crowne, and as this will shewe that I had no share in the spoyle which had bene made of his Estate in the tyme before, so it will appeare that my whole endeavor afterwards was to helpe to preserve that which was left, and this was not to be done by opposinge myselfe to Suitors only, but to those to whom he had committed the care of his affayres, which were then indeede more then ever out of frame....[33]

It was absurd of Carr to pretend to have been a reformer. His tremendous financial gains helped make James's regime unstable.

LANDED WEALTH

Carr would be given an increasingly active role in the king's affairs. This world of power demanded that its practitioners go beyond the suits and trappings of mere wealth to what would have been understood as real wealth, landed wealth. The king, who sought to ease Carr's passage into the group that mattered politically, must have let it be known that he required assistance in settling the right estate on the young man. The estate finally chosen, Sherborne, was originally suggested by the Earl of Salisbury. This was a very unfortunate choice for the future reputation of both the donor and the recipient. The castle and manor were taken from no less a "hero" of the nation and the protestant cause than Sir Walter Raleigh. However, taking up the cause of Raleigh, as did Prince Henry, mystified most contemporaries who loved Raleigh only after his death, and then in no small way as a reaction to James. Raleigh with his broad Devon speech and his high-handed, quarrelsome ways was considered a dangerous man.

The case of Raleigh, the Sherborne estate, and Carr is not without its irony. This property originally went from the crown to Sir Walter for ninety-nine years in January 1592.[34] Raleigh, to protect his children's inheritance before he was convicted of treason, conveyed his property to them. The legal vehicle or conveyance that was to transfer the titles was flawed and Sherborne reverted to the crown. Raleigh, from the Tower, even wrote

to his old rival, Salisbury, for help and sent a begging letter to Carr saying, "seeing your day is but now in the dawn and mine come to the evening ... not to begin your first building upon the ruin of the innocent."[35] Raleigh's pitiful legal and financial plight, his incarceration and his untimely end, have clouded the judgment of authors when they deal with Sherborne. In a letter, which seems not to have been noticed before, it turns out that Carr was willing to settle for money in lieu of the land. This composition money would allow Carr to buy land which would not put him in a legal and social morass and Raleigh would keep his beloved Sherborne. Raleigh, writing to Carr, said:

> I understand that if I make you no offer between this and Saturday next that it will not be your pleasure hereafter to herken to any composition. What the law will determine in this controversy your self shall better judg if it please you but once to hear my councell with your owne. For it is trew that I have no property att all in the land in question, for his majesties's mercifull graunts both of the land and leases in their own names, in which I have no other interest but as a father during the infancie of my childe and as a husband during my wives life....[36]

It is only when we see how Raleigh came by this plum, Sherborne, that a sense of perspective returns. Raleigh constantly passed this estate on his way from Devon to London and became determined to have it. It did not seem to matter to him that it was owned by a bishop. The queen

had to keep switching ecclesiastics in that bishopric until she found one old and weak enough, to be willing to give her the land so she could give it to Raleigh.[37]

Raleigh's cause was to soar and Carr's to plummet when one of the favorite's most dangerous opponents, Prince Henry, intervened. Henry was a predictable standard bearer for Raleigh, who was one of the young man's heroes. Henry, Raleigh, and their supporters at court prevailed in the matter of Sherborne after Henry went "with some anger to his father."[38] Unfortunately for Raleigh, when the prince died, late in 1612, the king gave the property to Carr.[39]

In January 1610, Carr was given the forfeited lands of Lord Maxwell in their native Scotland.[40] In July of the next year, he was granted in fee simple the Castle of Rochester with all appurtenances excepting knight's services.[41] In November 1612, Carr got his first pieces of a very rich prize indeed, the Darcy lands. These first parcels granted to him were unspecified lands in county Essex, which cost him twenty shillings.[42] By November 1613, the entire Darcy deal had been consummated.[43] This acquisition of much of the Darcy lands came about because the grant of the lands from the crown to Darcy specified they should revert to the crown in the event that no male heirs were born. No son was produced and in order to deed half of his lands to his son-in-law, Thomas Savage, the other half of the land and £24,000 had to be given by Darcy to Carr.[44] Although it

could be construed as bribery, this was an amicable settlement for all concerned.

It was in this year, 1613, that there seems to have been an attempt to grant or sell lands to Carr in a concentrated fashion instead of the previous method of giving those that were available. The first mention of this which was to unfold in county Durham says, "Part of the Westmoreland lands, as Raby, Bransback and Barne, are sold to Viscount Rochester, and it is thought he shall have the honours also."[45] In addition to these lands in Durham, Carr was also given the important manor of Brancepth.[46] That these were substantial acquisitions can be seen from the fact that he was given £2,000 interest on money that had been advanced for their purchases.[47] It may be that this concentration of lands in the North was a deliberate attempt to make Carr a great man in a local area as well as at the center of government, a theory that is at least partially confirmed by the fact that he was made Lord-Lieutenant of Durham.[48] It may have been this concentration of lands in the North and his creation as Treasurer of Scotland[49] which fueled the rumor that Carr was going to live in the North. If this had ever been the plan it was allowed to languish. The scheme of land concentration itself, if it had ever existed, seems to have broken down. Not that the favorite was deprived; by the following year, Somerset was said to have much land in Northamptonshire.[50] His major land holdings were rounded out in his last year of

power, 1615, when he was given the government and custody of the lands of Sir George Hayward, until Sir George who "is fallen mad ... recover."[51]

The remarkable thing about Carr's vast land holdings is that had he so desired, they could have been even more extensive. In a letter to Northampton, Rochester, as he then was, mentions that he refused Lord Montague's escheat and Cobham Hall so as not to offend.[52]

Robert Carr's attainder cost him much of his landed wealth. The biggest winner in the inevitable scramble for gain was the new favorite, George Villiers. Villiers acquired the Essex lands[53] and Sherborne[54] after its brief possession by Sir John Digby.[55] Carr's widespread holdings in the North went to Prince Charles.[56] Nonetheless, not all was lost. The king restored lands to him in 1617,[57] and by 1641 his yearly gross rental was still between £2,200 and £4,399.[58]

OTHER SOURCES OF GAIN

Carr enjoyed some rather uncommon sources of revenue beyond cash, land, bribes and gifts. The richest prize was a trading privilege[59] or allowance on cloths. In 1618 this allowance, which had been forfeited by Carr's attainder, was paying the queen £8,000 per annum and the king £3,000.[60] Carr also had obtained a lease of French and Rhenish wines for the royal household which in 1616 was worth £450 for one half a year to its holder, Sir John Dackombe.[61] Many incidentals of Carr's life were also provided for, such as his suite of rooms and the food for himself and many of his attendants as part of his "Bourge of Courte." Other benefits of his position, such as the opportunity to marry into one of England's greatest families, should not be lost sight of.

Robert Carr was, at times, more than the passive recipient of royal largesse. The early seventeenth-century English were passionate gamblers and risk takers. Their desire for windfall profits and willingness to speculate led to massive investment in the chartered trading companies. Robert Carr invested in two such companies. We have no other information than the raw knowledge that he was a shareholder in the North-West Passage Company and one other.[62] Carr also was a collector of art. As early as 1612, Overbury wrote to Trumbull in Brussels saying, "If upon the death of any great man in that country, you can help my lord of Rochester to any good bargain of excellent hangings at the second hand, or pictures or any household stuff which they

have there better than ours, it would be a very acceptable service to my lord."[63] By 1615, Carr had a famous and valuable collection including works by Tintoretto, Veronese, Bassano, and Titian.[64] Carr's fellow connoisseur, Arundel, was given the collection when the favorite fell.[65]

BRIBERY

Money and lands were not the only way to profit at court. Bribery and gift giving, those cancers of Jacobean government, were very important sources of wealth for the favorite. Gift giving was the oil of the king's governmental machinery. A gift, wrote Professor Hurstfield, "is no more than a payment to an official in the processes of administration because that is the accepted convention. It is an informal fee."[66] Since work in the king's service paid either no salary, or a ridiculously low one, many who served lived on the perquisites of the job and gifts. Carr's potential for abusing the system was, of course, derived much less from his offices than from his sway with the king. Gift giving at special times such as weddings, New Year's and birthdays was a much stronger and more costly custom then than now. The favorite's wedding, on 26 December 1613, brought him many rich gifts including the Earl of Salisbury's suit of hangings which had cost his father £1,500 and another suit worth £800.[67] The bride's great-uncle, the Earl of Northampton, presented plate valued at £1,500 and a sword worth £500 not including the workmanship valued at 100 marks.[68] Others showed their zeal in a different fashion. Francis Bacon refused offers to share with him the £2,000 expense of one of the wedding masques.[69] Fittingly enough, the king defrayed the £10,000 expense of the wedding festivities.[70] James was also forthcoming on other special occasions such as in May 1611 when £100 was spent for Carr's

Garter when he was inducted into that order.[71]

Hurstfield's idea that "all gifts are potentially corrupt,"[72] is borne out in Carr's case. One gets the feeling from some of those mentioned above, excepting gifts from the king, that they were given not to the person of Robert Carr but to the kingdom's most important subject or to his position as chief favorite. That such munificence often had an obviously mercenary tinge can be seen from the following example. In October 1614, Sir John Vaughan thanked the favorite for interceding with the king for a grant of a place under the prince. Slightly over two months later Carr received £100 as a New Year's gift from the same suitor.[73] A better known example of a would-be bribe involved the tax farmer and future Lord Mayor of London, John Swinnerton. Swinnerton and his patron, Northampton, had been trying to wrest control of the Great Farm[74] both before and after it fell in again in 1611. After 1605, Swinnerton also tried to regain control of that other "gold mine," the farm on the import of wine. Swinnerton tried to gain Rochester's aid with a personal gift of £1,000[75] per annum and a fine of £6,000[76] "Rochester's favour was already engaged to the present farmers. Powerful and persistent as he was, Northampton could not compete with the king's favorite and his own dear friend."[77] Swinnerton had lost the farm on wines as well as the Great Farm.

Not all of the offers to Carr were in hard cash. The

East India Company in 1614 used plate, which was considered almost as liquid as coin itself, to influence Carr. One of their number, Richard Gosson, in a letter to Somerset said the Company, "have agreed to present his Lordship with gold plate, value, £600."[78] The largest bribe that Carr received was the spectacular one of £7,000. Carr obtained this money in 1614 from Sir Ralph Winwood, who used it to secure the position of Secretary.[79]

The foregoing plus the previously mentioned £24,000 and half the Darcy lands given to Carr in order to pass the rest of the land to a son-in-law, perhaps creates an erroneous impression of Carr and bribery. These rather damning examples are drawn from the latter part of his life at court and probably do not give a well-rounded picture. In the early part of his career his boast that, "I ame the courtier whose handes never tooke bribe"[80] probably reflected the facts at that time, 1612, granted that he probably interpreted gifts at face value. That he surmounted such scruples later on has been seen in cases such as those involving Swinnerton, Darcy, and Winwood. Carr's absence from the list of those who were pensioners of the Spanish[81] was to his credit especially since the king himself could not resist such a pension. Perhaps the secret of the favorite's conduct is that he may have cleared potential gifts and bribes with the king. The pattern of checking with the king was at least followed when the Spanish offered

Carr for his wedding a jewel worth £780 and his bride, diamonds worth £768.[82]

SALE OF TITLES AND HONESTY

Two potential gold mines which Carr adamantly refused to exploit were the selling of titles and the selling of office. We have no evidence of Carr selling an office and in a letter, previously referred to, he says "I would not sett tytles to sale for my private endes."[83] Along with this lack of desire to sell titles was a lack of opportunity. The new order of baronetcy, created in 1611, is one example "because of the stringent conditions of ancestry and wealth, the high price, and the growing hostility to the whole order among the gentry, no new baronets came forward for three years from 1612 to 1614."[84] This was, of course, when the favorite's star was at its zenith. He also knew that involvement in this market would have cost him a good deal in popularity and he was aware that as a non-Englishman and favorite he had to tread lightly. Many members of the 1614 Parliament showed their dislike of the whole idea of an order of baronets and unsuccessfully demanded its abolition. The unashamed exploitation of title and office-selling would have to wait for the rise of George Villiers.

A case which started in 1615 and was resolved in the 1630s may be important in one's assessment of Carr's honesty. In February 1615, he was given a commission to inventory the jewels remaining in the secret jewel house in the Tower.[85] That summer, rumors spread that he had "appropriated a considerable quantity of the crown jewels, and he, to insure himself against this and every other charge, begged his

Majesty for an absolute pardon...."[86] The true reason behind his desire for a pardon was the death of Overbury but there was also meat to the charge of the theft. Many years later in 1633, Carr was brought up on charges of improperly having a crown jewel and after making many excuses promised to render it and was dismissed with "a sharp reprehension."[87]

In conclusion, Carr fits one of Hurstfield's definitions of corruption in that his was a case where, "state revenues are diverted into private purses...."[88] While it is true that Carr was in the end corrupt, given the opportunities he passed over, his mien was not avaricious and he seemed wisely content with the remarkable amount of plunder which came from James.

CHAPTER II - FOOTNOTES

[1] G. L. Harris, "Medieval Doctrines in the Debates on Supply, 1610-1629" in K. Sharpe, ed., Faction and Parliament (Oxford, 1978), p. 76.

[2] Ibid., p. 75.

[3] F. C. Dietz, English Public Finance 1558-1641, 2 vols. (New York, 1932), ii, p. 103.

[4] Ibid., p. 105.

[5] Gardiner, England, ii, p. 42.

[6] Dietz, Finance, ii, p. 118. This was roughly the equivalent of one year's revenue, but granted the terrible cost of Elizabeth's wars, this was not as bad as it may seem. Most of the debts were not yet due and great sums were owing to the English crown, particularly from the Dutch. The latter eventually compounded their obligations in 1616, the English then returning the cautionary towns which they garrisoned at considerable cost.

[7] Ibid., p. 121. One estimate for 1608, however, places the total debt as just short of £1,000,000. Russell, Crisis of Parliaments, p. 274.

[8] Ibid., p. 149.

[9] A. G. R. Smith, "Crown, Parliament and Finance: The Great Contract of 1610," in The English Commonwealth, 1547-1640, Peter Clark, A. G. R. Smith and Nicholas Tyacke, eds., (Leicester, 1979), p. 113.

[10] Dietz, Finance, ii, p. 147.

[11] Two articles which give much good information including the forms that royal bounty could take are to be found in Wallace MacCaffrey's "Place and Patronage in Elizabethan Politics" in Elizabethan Government and Society, Essays Presented to Sir John Neale (London, 1961), pp. 95-126; and J. E. Neale "The Elizabethan Political Scene" in Essays in Elizabethan History (London, 1958), pp. 59-84.

[12] Cf. below, p. 54.

[13] Thomas Howard in Aikin, Memoirs, i, p. 327.

[14]Stone, Crisis, p. 563.

[15]Aikin, Memoirs, i, p. 327-328.

[16]C.S.P. Dom., 1603-1610, p. 385.

[17]Ibid., p. 417.

[18]H.M.C. Hatfield, xix, p. 456.

[19]Ibid., xix, p. 305.

[20]For Carr's role in the demise of this Parliament see pp. 91-92.

[21]C.S.P. Dom., 1603-1610, p. 599. 7 April 1610. To pay this £20,000 James borrowed from reluctant London lenders. See R. Ashton, The Crown and the Money Market, 1603-1640 (Oxford, 1960), pp. 118 et passim. The situation of a rich favorite and a begging king would continue.

[22]C.S.P. Dom., 1603-1610, p. 596, March 1610.

[23]H.M.C. Downshire, iii, p. 20.

[24]Stone, Crisis, p. 416.

[25]Nichols, Progresses, ii, p. 416.

[26]C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 48, June 1611.

[27]Ibid., p. 120, February 1612.

[28]Nichols, Progresses, ii, p. 416. Carr also received £6,000 worth of cargo from the wrecked ship Pearl in 1613. M. Prestwich, Cranfield, p. 125.

[29]C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 211, November 1613.

[30]Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 480. Prestwich in Cranfield, says on page 108 that this £90,000 was nearly a quarter of the annual revenue of the crown. She mistakenly says Carr "dissipated" instead of received this £90,000 in 1612.

[31]Ashton, Money Market, p. 18. Chamberlain, Letters, i, p. 444, says this was £22,000.

[32]Spedding, Bacon, v, p. 80. This was the Free Gift of 1614.

[33] Archaeologia, xvii, pp. 288-289.

[34] R. Lacy, Sir Walter Ralegh (London, 1973), p. 179.

[35] J. Matter, My Lords and Lady of Essex: Their State Trials (Chicago, 1969), p. 100, citing Harleian Ms. 6908, fol. 4.

[36] H.M.C. DeL'Isle and Dudley, v, p. 55.

[37] Lacy, Sir Walter Ralegh, p. 180.

[38] W. Raleigh, T. Birch, ed., The Works of Sir Walter Raleigh 8 vols. (Oxford, 1829) viii, p. 788.

[39] For the fate of these lands after Carr's fall see p. 48.

[40] Cokayne, viii, p. 66.

[41] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 52, July 1611.

[42] Ibid., p. 160, November 1612.

[43] Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 489. Darcy was Thomas, third Lord Darcy of Chiche.

[44] Ibid., p. 489. Carr also got £3,550 of £10,550 due the crown from Sir Thomas Sherley in 1614. D. W. Davies, Elizabethans Errant (New York, 1967), pp. 268-269.

[45] H.M.C. Downshire, iv, p. 230.

[46] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 211. November 1613. That this was not a happy relationship can be seen by the following letter. "Harsh conduct of the servants of the Earl of Somerset to the tenants at Brancepath. On the announcement by the Bishop of Durham that the further spoil of the woods was forbidden, the joy of all was exceedingly great, bells were rung, bonfires blazed, and drummers went up and down...." C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 328, November 1615.

[47] Ibid., p. 211. November 1613.

[48] J. Sainty, Lieutenants of Counties, 1585-1642 (London, 1970), p. 45.

[49] DNB 23 December 1613. See below p. 66.

[50] Such rumors were constantly on the wing.

[51] Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 579.

[52] Egerton Papers, p. 455.

[53] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 444, March 1617.

[54] Ibid., p. 444.

[55] Sir John Digby (1586-1653) got it for £10,000. R. Lloyd, Dorset Elizabethans (London, 1967), p. 282. The accepted figure of its worth when Villiers got it was £26,000. Roger Lockyer, Buckingham, The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592-1628 (New York, 1980), p. 31.

[56] Chamberlain Letters, ii, p. 25.

[57] Ibid., p. 449, March 1617.

[58] Stone, Crisis, p. 761.

[59] Ibid., p. 429.

[60] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 595, November 1618.

[61] Ibid., p. 410, November 1618.

[62] Rabb, Enterprise and Empire, p. 261.

[63] H.M.C. Downshire, iii, p. 369.

[64] E. F. Carritt, A Calendar of British Taste from 1600-1800 (London, 1949), p. 14.

[65] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 401, November 1616.

[66] Joel Hurstfield, Freedom, Corruption and Government in Elizabethan England (London, 1973), p. 151. This seems to be the middle ground between Prestwich who says Cranfield was corrupt because he took gifts from tax farmers (Prestwich, Cranfield, p. 241), and Neale who sees it as almost inevitable (Neale, "The Elizabethan Political Scene," p. 60).

[67] Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 497.

[68] Ibid., i, p. 497. 100 marks were worth about £65.

[69] Spedding, Bacon, iv, p. 394.

[70] Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 487.

[71] Ibid., ii, p. 31, May 1611.

[72] Hurstfield, Freedom Corruption, p. 151.

[73] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 261, December 1614.

[74] The crown found it more profitable to have private groups collect customs. The Great Farm covered customs on all incoming and outgoing goods excepting such things as silk, gold thread and wines.

[75] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 166, January 1613.

[76] Ibid., p. 166.

[77] Linda Levy Peck, "Problems in Jacobean Administration: Was Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, A Reformer?" Historical Journal, 19 (1976), p. 854.

[78] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 229, April 1614.

[79] D'Ewes, Autobiography, p. 70. For more on the events surrounding the choosing of this Secretary see pp. 105-107.

[80] Egerton Papers, p. 455.

[81] Sarmiento said Carr should get Salisbury's former pension of £1,500. Archaeologia, xli, p. 155.

[82] Archaeologia, xli, p. 153.

[83] Egerton Papers, p. 455.

[84] Stone, Crisis, p. 89.

[85] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 272, February 1615.

[86] Archaeologia, xli, p. 175.

[87] H.M.C. Bath, ii, p. 55.

[88] Hurstfield, Freedom Corruption, p. 162.

CHAPTER III

CARR AND OFFICE

OFFICES CARR RECEIVED

Carr's first office, Gentleman of the Bedchamber, which he received in 1607, was to be his only office for the first four years of his career. In February of 1611, Carr was headed toward his first court position beyond the confines of the bedchamber and toward his eventual domination of office and the decision-making process. We are told in a letter from William Devick to William Trumbull that Carr was about to get the Keepership of the Privy Purse.[1] This position, as its name implies, would keep its holder in close proximity to the king. It dealt with sensitive foreign affairs and often operated as a secret service fund[2] and as such was not audited: "alone among paymasters of spending departments, the Keeper of the King's Privy Purse did not have to account at all anywhere."[3] The office in 1600 had a budget of £2,000[4] but despite such a modest economic foundation it was an administrative position and it showed the trust which the king was starting to place in this young man.

Carr's next two places would also keep him in close proximity to the king since they both dealt with the Palace of Westminster. One of these offices, which Carr was given early in the summer of 1611, was the Keeper of the Palace of Westminster.[5] Carr was given the second of these offices, High Steward of Westminster, at some point in 1612.[6]

These offices which Carr received only after the eclipse of Salisbury, faded into insignificance when Carr

was given effective responsibility for the office of Secretary,[7] one of the most important positions in government. The following description shows how, in some ways, it was suited to the role James had chosen for Robert Carr:

> The secretary remained, nevertheless, in a somewhat betwixt and between condition: definitely a leading officer of state, yet also a personal servant of the Crown, in close and constant contact with the sovereign, more frequently resident at court than other officials- a cross between a minister, a high civil servant, and a courtier.[8]

Making Carr acting Secretary,[9] in July 1612, was the start of James's design to introduce bedchamber government. This was not a spur-of-the-moment idea; the king had used James Hay and Fenton[10] on an ad hoc basis during Salisbury's many minor and increasingly lengthy illnesses. After Salisbury's exit people felt it would be business as usual and such an important office as Secretary would be quickly filled. While potential candidates jostled and observers speculated, the implication of making Carr the new controller of the signet[11] was lost. John Chamberlain had caught wind of it and at the end of July reported that "the Lord of Rochester hath some other privie signet assigned him to seale what the King meanes to kepe secret to himself and those he thincks goode."[12]

Had James clearly outlined his plan[13] for bedchamber government, much of the bitterness and confusion surrounding

the secretaryship for the next two years could have been avoided.

Many must have felt that Carr's transition from favorite and advisor to great administrator could not be accomplished so rapidly. However, since there was no Secretary the correspondence probably would have inevitably drifted in Carr's direction because of his proximity to James and the king's public displays of confidence in him. A letter from July 1612 illustrating this tendency was written by Lord Sheffield[14] to the favorite. It begins with the observation, "There being no Foreign Secretary...."[15]

Speculation about the choice of a new Secretary began again when the king's and favorite's effectiveness slackened.[16] Carr had many other formal and informal duties besides his secretarial work. Delays by him in processing his workload were so noticeable that by the fall of 1612 some began to wonder if he was "embracing too much at once."[17] The main reason Carr looked ineffective was that not only was he directing the secretaryship, he was also taking care of the details. "Buckingham had one major advantage, denied his predecessor, in that much of the routine work of administration was carried out by the two Secretaries of State, Sir Thomas Lake and Sir Robert Naunton."[18] James's vacillations also had a part to play in the poor showing of this part of bedchamber government. By late January 1613, the king was distancing himself from the hard work of the

office; "for though his Majestie at first tooke delight to shew his readiness and abilitie in those causes, yet that vigor begins to relent, and he must dayly more and more intend his owne health and quiet."[19] It is wrong to assume that because the king's interest waned the experiment was left to die on the vine.[20] In spite of continued talk of a Secretary "under"[21] Carr or the appointment of a Secretary with Carr to keep the foreign business in his hands[22] the favorite soldiered on.[23]

Carr lacked Salisbury's capacity, industry, and training, but despite his lack of suitability and preparation he was given a compliment early in his stint. The Earl of Northampton flatteringly wrote to Carr, "Many people, noting his Lordship's skill in answering letters, and his urbanity, wish to see him Secretary."[24] Historians have rightly seen James's experiment with the secretaryship as retrogressive, but if contemporary analysis of Carr's role is correct perhaps a minor re-evaluation of the favorite's part is in order. Sir John Throckmorton, who could hardly be described as being in Carr's camp, wrote on 10 October 1613 that "Rochester hath the dispatch of all great business of state in his own hands, sees the greatness of the place and surely will not leave it till he be pleased to ease himself of the pains he takes, which I hear is great."[25] This idea was amplified and elaborated later that month when Throckmorton wrote, "The businesses of State are still

managed by Rochester and his wisdom is not likely to suffer him to leave it understanding it so well as he doth."[26]

Carr had so many offices in England that he could be accused of pluralism. Absenteeism[27] could have been added to the accusations after Carr was given the position of Treasurer of Scotland.[28] The previous Treasurer, Sir George Home, Earl of Dunbar, was the single most important man in Scotland besides James from 1603 until his death in January 1611.[29] Dunbar provided the hard work behind James's claim that he ruled Scotland with his pen. Arthur Wilson said that Carr was made Treasurer to add lustre to his power and we should look on the appointment as cosmetic.[30] This lack of influence by Carr in Scottish affairs fits with Maurice Lee's thesis that if indeed Scotland was ruled by the pen the writing was most definitely done in Edinburgh.[31]

REVERSIONS

In 1612, Robert Carr received, in the form of a reversion, one of the greatest plums in the kingdom. This office of prothonotary in the King's Bench is also known as the chief clerkship.[32] The reason it was considered a great prize is that its real annual value is estimated at between £4,000 and £6,000 which would put it in the same league with such offices as the Mastership of the Wards.[33] In 1612 the officeholder, Sir John Roper, apparently was willing to surrender the reversion to Carr in return for a peerage. Carr writing to Northampton said "your Lordship knowes I refused to come by the possession of Sir John Ross's office by moving the King to make him a Baron, because I would not sett tytles to sale for my private endes."[39] Carr finally did get the reversion but he fell before he could exploit the office. Seddon concludes that Carr got this reversion because he was denied Salisbury's major offices.[35]

One of the most interesting offices Carr wanted was that of the Master of the Horse.[36] This position, which came with a staff of 150, was above all household offices except the High Steward and Chamberlain.[37] Principally thought of as the controlling officer of the Stables with prominent ceremonial functions,[38] the Master of the Horse helped the Lord Chamberlain supervise the masques given at royal expense.[39] Carr's intention of becoming Master of the Horse became known in 1612 when, uncharacteristically, he began fighting hard to wrestle the position from its holder, Edward

Somerset, Earl of Worcester.[40] There was a carrot offered for the Mastership, "great meanes made to the earle of Worcester to resign his mastership of the horse to him [Carr]."[41] This plan went no farther than the talking stage but the favorite pushed his way into performing the duties for the opening of the 1614 Parliament, "the earle of Somerset supplied the place of master of the horse, because the earle of Worcester was or wold be sicke, so that he hath alredy the possession of that office as yet were by anticipation."[42] Pembroke, whose pursuit of office and rivalry with the favorite made him seem like Carr's shadow, also wanted to become Master of the Horse. His wish was fulfilled in 1616 when Worcester finally gave it up for £1,500 per annum[43] and the position of Lord Privy Seal.

LORD CHAMBERLAIN

CINQUE PORTS

LORD PRIVY SEAL

Northampton's untimely death in 1614 touched off another major redistribution of offices. It was well known about the court that Pembroke would become very unhappy if he were not the successful candidate for the office of Lord Chamberlain, left vacant when Suffolk moved to Northampton's former place as Lord Treasurer.[44] In spite of Pembroke's pressure and a pretended promise by the queen,[45] Robert Carr was made Lord Chamberlain on 10 July 1614.[46] The king noted that "no man shold marvayle that he bestowed a place so neere himself upon his frend, whom he loved above all men living."[47]

The Lord Chamberlain was the principal[48] officer about the king's person. His jurisdiction was the household above the stairs including the Outer, Privy, and Bed Chambers. "What the Household was responsible for providing, the Chamber saw was consumed with due pomp and elegance."[49] Since the Chamberlain looked after the sovereign's daily needs, he was in charge of such things and people as the Royal Chapel and Chaplains, physicians, surgeons, and apothecaries, the astronomer, the serjeant-painter, musicians royal fools and even the rat and mole takers.[50] His control of what we would call departments included the Great Wardrobe, Revels, Tents and Toils (or fabrics), Works, Armoury, and Ordnance and Mint.[51] An innovation, during Carr's tenure, saw the creation of a subordinate position, the Master of the Ceremonies, "whose function was to look

after the lodgings and the general well-being of ambassadors, and to grapple with the knotty problems entailed by their inveterate stickling for precedence and etiquette.[52] In 1614 the Chamberlain, instead of the Privy Council, began to sign warrants for payments to players. The one example we have of Carr operating ex officio as Lord Chamberlain involved a dispute between the watermen and players although no decision was reached on the question and Carr supported the watermen despite being the official protector of the players.[53] Pembroke, who had a promise of the reversion,[54] became Lord Chamberlain when Robert Carr fell.[55]

As early as July 1614, a rumor was aflight that Carr was about to become Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports.[56] These ports (originally five of them) had at one time provided most of the ships for the Royal Navy and were the country's first line of defense from the continent. In return for these obligations they were given many franchises and privileges including the revenues from their courts. In 1614 the favorite wrote to the Council as provisional Warden to let them know that the king wanted the French exempted from paying head money within the Cinque Ports.[57]

An office of great if fluctuating potential was that of Lord Privy Seal which Northampton had held from 1608 until his death. Carr was appointed almost immediately.[58] This office had declined in power after the appointment of two

Principal Secretaries in 1540, but had in dignity increased.[59] Its origins as secretary to the king[60] and its later place as head of the Court of Requests[61] are probably the best explanation as towhy it was given to Carr. In July 1614, Carr wrote to the Attorney General and officers of the Exchequer, "prohibiting the ejection of subjects from their lands, until the case has been tried, and verdict given in the King's behalf."[62] It is little wonder that the clerks of the Privy Seal were afraid that Somerset's lack of experience and frequent absences in following the king would prove prejudicial to them since the above notice is the only one we have of Carr being active in this office. It appears that he wanted it to use as bait to be offered to the Earl of Worcester for the Mastership of the Horse.[63] This switch did take place but after the fall of the favorite.[64]

CARR'S POWER

The enormous power that Robert Carr wielded cannot be underestimated. His power was commented on in every season of every year from 1611 until 1616 by Scots, English, ambassadors, foreigners, peers, commoners, friends, enemies, courtiers, and those up from the country.[65] In May 1611, a year before Salisbury's death, Carr was already being spoken of as being, "further in the King's graces than any other subject."[66] In January 1612 it was said of the favorite, "all addresses are made to Sir Robert Carr, he is the Favorit in ordinary; no suite, no reward, but comes by him; his hand distributes, and his hand restrains; our supreme power works by second causes."[67] In June 1612 it was said, "Rochester is exceeding great with his majesty, and if I shulde say trewle, greater than anye that ever I did see...."[68] This idea was echoed in November when Fenton writing to the Earl of Mar wrote, "that man who dois all maye do what he will an noe man to control him, his power is greater than any that ever I have seen in his place and no man to gainsay him."[69] A representative sample from 1613 mirrors that of 1612. Early in the year it was rhetorically asked, "What can be too strong for this Hercules who governs Jupiter and the globe under his feet."[70] James, who was said to resolve all business with Carr, in 1613, showed the world which way the wind was blowing by telling the Lord Mayor of London to treat the favorite like the king during Carr's wedding.[71] No change was made to the pattern in 1614. Carr was said to

be the man with whom the king decided everything.[72] It was well known at this time that nothing was done without Carr's mediation.[73] Even those unused to the ways of the king were impressed, "I am a stranger at Whitehall and cannot witness but by the universal effects Somerset's greatness...."[74] The consequence of Carr's great power was that he became more envied and more opposed as his power increased.

CHAPTER III - FOOTNOTES

[1] H.M.C. Downshire, iii, p. 20.

[2] G. E. Aylmer, The King's Servants, The Civil Service of Charles I (London, 1961), p. 227.

[3] Ibid., p. 35.

[4] G. R. Elton, ed., The Tudor Constitution, Documents and Commentary (Cambridge, 1960), p. 46.

[5] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 57.

[6] G. E. Cokayne, Complete Peerage, xii, p. 67.

[7] Second Secretary Herbert held a different office and at no time did he take an important part in public affairs. F. M. G. Evans, The Principal Secretary of State (London, 1923), p. 68.

[8] Elton, Tudor Constitution, p. 119.

[9] "Rochester is often included in lists of secretaries of state, presumably on the ground that he kept the signet. But, although the secretary was originally appointed merely by the conferment of the signet, letters patent have also been issued since 1577, and there were frequently examples in the seventeenth century of persons keeping the signet for a period without being secretaries...." Evans, Secretary, p. 69.

[10] Ibid., p. 67. Lord Fenton was Thomas Erskine (1566-1639). In 1600 he had protected James by killing Alexander Ruthven at Gowrie House. He was given his highest title, Earl of Kellie, in 1619.

[11] Carr received the signet at some point before July 1612.

[12] Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 372.

[13] James felt that with the help of Carr he was completely capable of "directing the complicated machinery of the domestic and foreign policy of the Government himself." Gardiner, England, ii, p. 148.

[14] Edmund Sheffield, the first Earl of Mulgrave (1564-1646). Under James he became President of the Council of the North.

[15] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 139.

[16] R. Winwood, Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I, E. Sawyer, ed., iii, p. 421. The Council was pleading that a new Secretary be named.

[17] Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 387.

[18] Lockyer, Buckingham, p. 37.

[19] Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 409. James was suffering from gout of the big toe.

[20] Kynaston makes this error by failing to trace the position up to and including the period when Winwood held it. D. Kynaston, The Secretary of State (Lavenham, Suffolk, 1978), pp. 72-73.

[21] Chamberlain Letters, pp. 480, 483.

[22] "It is thocht there shalbe one or two Secreterryes; but Summersett will keepe all forraine besines in his owin hands." Viscount Fenton to the Earl of Mar, 19 November 1613. H.M.C. Mar and Kellie supplement, p. 56.

[23] "Somerset is so oppressed with multiplicity of affairs, as you are not to marvel if you receive not such satisfaction as were to be wished." Sir Thomas Edmondes to William Trumbull, 25 February 1614. H.M.C. Downshire, p. 319.

[24] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 144.

[25] H.M.C. Downshire, iv, p. 221.

[26] Ibid., p. 228.

[27] Carr never returned to Scotland after 1603.

[28] The Treasurer's duties included the collection of the revenues arising from the crown property, customs and burgh ferms and the management of the finance of the royal household. Sir F. Maurice Powicke and E. B. Fryde, eds., Handbook of British Chronology, 2nd ed. (London, 1961), p. 183.

[29]Lee, "James Government of Scotland," p. 42. In 1610 Home also became Comptroller and the combination of this position with that of the Lord Treasurer continued with Carr and later Treasurers. F. M. Powicke, Handbook, p. 185. It is interesting to note that using Carr's help, his kinsman, Sir Thomas Hamilton, wanted to fill Dunbar's place and become the "new great man in Scotland." M. Lee, "James VI's Government," p. 47. The plan failed but Hamilton did become Secretary in 1612 and Clerk Register in the same year. F. M. Powicke, Handbook, pp. 187, 190.

[30]Wilson, History, p. 55.

[31]M. Lee, "James VI's Government," p. 53.

[32]M. Blatcher, The Court of King's Bench, 1450-1550. A Study in Self-Help (London, 1978), pp. 145, 152-153.

[33]Aylmer, King's Servants, p. 214.

[34]Egerton Papers, p. 455.

[35]Seddon, "Robert Carr," pp. 54-55.

[36]The appointment was by patent and included a 1,000 mark fee. E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, i, (Oxford, 1961), p. 34.

[37]Aylmer, King's Servants, p. 30.

[38]These functions included leading the sovereign's bridle on progresses and state occasions. Chambers, Elizabethan Stage, i, p. 107.

[39]Ibid., pp. 100, 207.

[40]Worcester (1553-1628) received the position when the Earl of Essex was executed in 1601. DNB.

[41]Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 360.

[42]Ibid., p. 522.

[43]Stone, Crisis, p. 420.

[44]Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 502. On his death bed Northampton sought to deny any of his offices to Pembroke. Ibid., ii, p. 542.

[45]Ibid., ii, p. 542.

[46]Cokayne, Peerage, xii, p. 67.

[47]Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 548.

[48]The Lord Chamberlain had a staff of about 750 and every year received at least £4,862 in the period 1629-1640. Aylmer, King's Servants, p. 206. His diet, the number of meat dishes provided for his table, was second only to the king's at ten dishes, twice daily. Ibid., p. 168.

[49]Ibid., p. 29.

[50]Because of interest since that time in the period's literature perhaps the most well known group were the players. Chambers, Elizabethan Stage, i, pp. 36-41, et passim.

[51]Ibid., i, p. 49.

[52]Ibid., i, p. 53.

[53]The watermen wanted the players to return to their former venues on the south side of the river so that there would be a need for the watermen's services. Chambers, Elizabethan Stage, ii, pp. 371-372.

[54]Chambers, Elizabethan Stage, i, p. 41.

[55]23 December 1615. Cokayne, x, p. 413.

[56]H.M.C. Downshire, iv, p. 452. Northampton was the previous office holder.

[57]C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 260. Head money was a special tax on foreigners. For the tremendous importance of this office see J. K. Gruenfelder, "The Lord Wardens and Elections, 1604-1628," Journal of British Studies, 15-16 (1975-1977), pp. 1-23.

[58]This was given to Carr sometime before 30 June 1614. Powicke, Handbook, p. 94.

[59]Ibid., p. 90.

[60]Evans, Secretary of State, p. 2.

[61]Aylmer, King's Servants, p. 14.

[62]C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 240.

[63]See above pp. 84-85.

[64]Powicke, Handbook, p. 94.

[65]Not one contemporary said Carr was less than very powerful.

[66]C.S.P. Venice, 1610-1613, p. 142.

[67]Wilson, History, p. 55.

[68]H.M.C. Mar and Kellie Supplement, p. 41.

[69]Ibid., p. 46.

[70]H.M.C. Portland, ix, p. 31.

[71]H.M.C. Downshire, iv, p. 286.

[72]C.S.P. Venice, 1613-1615, p. 219.

[73]Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 510.

[74]H.M.C. Portland, ix, p. 28.

CHAPTER IV

CARR AND POLICY

CARR AND THE PRIVY COUNCIL

The prestige and power of the Privy Council fell a good deal at the hands of James, Carr, and bedchamber government. Very soon after Salisbury's death, some contemporaries observed that the Privy Council no longer seemed to occupy its former preeminence in the nation's councils.[1] If later evidence is to be trusted, James may have already begun to move towards a system of divided government. Notably in foreign policy, but possibly in other matters, after 1618 James was clearly requiring different groups of officials to develop contrasting policies and to report directly to him. James alone knew the full picture,[2] and a result was that frank discussion among privy councillors was neither possible nor always desirable. There were, of course, many variations. Nothing could have been more important than the Cockayne Project[3] with respect to commerce, royal finance, and foreign affairs. Across several years this was fully debated, but in such a climate as to make it clear that only one conclusion was really possible. The king had made up his mind, and reluctant councillors grudgingly fell into step with him.

The Privy Council was an ancient institution, whose origins are to be found in the Curia Regis. The continuous evolution of the modern Privy Council can be traced from Thomas Cromwell's reforms,[4] an extremely important legacy:

> the King's council continued to retain the multiplicity of functions it had had in an earlier age, acting as a

> court for administering the king's justice, a body of counsellors to give the sovereign advice, an assembly to assist him in legislation, and a group of officials assisting him to carry on the executive work. At the end of the middle ages the king's council or privy council was the principal organ through which he governed his realm....[5]

Professor Aylmer has called it, "(under the King) the supreme executive body in the country," and with the Secretaries of State and the Seals as the "core or spine of the system."[6] The ambitious Prince Henry paid it a compliment by seeking unsuccessfully for membership. Yet that which was denied to the heir was after his death to be granted to Carr.

The decision of who should and who should not sit on the Privy Council was, of course, dependent on the sovereign. Great office holders such as the Lord Treasurer and the Lord Chancellor were automatically included, as were some men of affairs, for example the Earl of Pembroke, who headed a very important family. Given his rawness, Carr's inclusion in these ranks looks embarrassing, especially when it is recalled that one of the oldest duties of the Privy Council was to give informed advice on weighty public and private matters. He could hardly be more removed from Professor Elton's list of criteria and description of functions. Carr's promotion is partly explained by James's criterion for selection: he "regarded membership somewhat as a mark of royal favor, as if it were another rank in the nobility...."[7]

The size of the Council fluctuated a good deal from reign to reign. Mary's Privy Council was above fifty in number while Elizabeth's is considered much more efficient at about twelve.[8] The largest number under James was about thirty-five in the 1620's. The size of the Privy Council, in the first record that we have of Robert Carr's attendance,[9] lists a total of twenty-three.[10] The last record we have of the numbers while Carr was there lists a total of twenty-four.[11] The average number for all sixty-five occasions when he is known to have been there was slightly under eleven.

While Robert Carr was a member, the Jacobean Privy Council underwent a radical transformation; however, this was almost totally coincidence, not cause and effect. For reasons which might include his unfamiliarity with his new kingdom, greater interest in the more material aspects of his new realm or more likely his leaving business to the very able Salisbury, James for the first phase of his reign allowed the Privy Council almost a free hand. "The Council spares the King the trouble of governing," wrote the Venetian Ambassador, "and not only do all subjects transact their business with it, but foreign representatives as well, and one might say it was the very ears, body and voice of the King." Again he wrote that James, "remits everything to the Council," and "has virtually given it full and absolute authority."[12]

It is pertinent to provide some illustration of the

matters handled on occasions when Carr is known to have been present. Whether or not he contributed to discussion is another matter. In most instances, the Register notes problems and the decisions taken by the Council as to what action should be taken. The majority of entries concern rather ordinary matters. High policy was, of course, discussed, but only very rarely does the official record give much enlightenment.

The security and order of the realm consumed a large portion of the Privy Council's time and energy. A highly visible example of security concerned arms and the armed. Carr was attendant at the Privy Council when permission was given to increase the small number of London men who could receive martial training (from 250 to 500). Three and a half months later, in March 1615, orders were dispatched to the Justices of the Peace and the Deputy Lieutenants of the counties to help the Muster Masters.[13] A survey was also sent out to the Lieutenants requesting information about the preparedness of men and equipment and ordering ranks to be filled, all to take part and everything to be brought up to standard.[14] Soldiers were also directed to give aid to the civil authorities, as when twelve Cumberland soldiers along with a provost were ordered to apprehend robbers who had broken out of the Newcastle jail.[15] Internal security and the concern it caused was matched by concern for the external as well. On 6 July 1614, a letter was sent to the

Justices of the Peace in Kent saying that "there are at this present readie to be transported unto the partes beyond the seas five and twenty pieces of bastard culverin...."[16] The Council naturally wanted this stopped. A look at external security on the wider continental stage is also to be seen in "five warrants to allow soldiers to go fight for the King's friends."[17] An attempt to organize against piracy, that costly plague on commerce, is also mentioned.[18]

The prevention of civil strife due to hardship was also paid close attention to by Carr and his fellow councillors. In the summer of 1614, when corn became scarce in Wiltshire and some were driven to steal or starve, the Privy Council sought information on wages.[19] The Council also sought to stop "the plague of beggars, rogues and thieves" in and around London with the threat that recipients of their directive, the Justices of the Peace would answer for their negligence.[20] Some of their concern was given to matters after the fact, such as the orders to aid the king's agents in helping to find some murderers in Kent.[21]

The Privy Council sought to oversee those coming into the country as well as those leaving. Twice, passes were issued to Ambassadors to allow them to return to their posts.[21] This formal approval is less important than decisions on individual requests for permission to travel. There were eleven such requests in twenty-six months. Many of these are not very detailed; however, some are very

pointed. One such pass procured by Carr's secretary, John Packer, allowed Thomas Tyrie, a Dundee Gentleman, "to travel beyond the seas for three years and to take with him one man, and necessarys not prohibited, with provisio not to go to Rome."[23] Another pass in the same vein makes stronger specific restrictions, "with this proviso, not to repaire to the city of Rome nor to any other partes that are not in leage and amity with his majesty."[24] A travel pass aimed at restricting internal movement was issued in 1615 for a recusant convict to travel in England because he was executor for his brother's will.[25] The Privy Council also gave orders for people not to leave town.[26]

The Privy Council was perceived by foreign governments as powerful and prestigious so it seemed the natural place for Englishmen to go to get help in redressing their grievances abroad. For example, one case concerned a ship which the French authorities had for four months prevented from sailing. A ruling in favor of the English master in the French courts had been stayed. The English Ambassador, Sir Thomas Edmondes, was requested to get restitution.[27] A second example involved two Englishmen who held £9,000 worth of property in Spain. Their factor, or agent, had evidently turned Roman Catholic and defrauded the owners. Sir John Digby, the English Ambassador, was asked to intervene with the Spanish government on their behalf.[28]

There is a smattering of information about the Privy Council's dealings with other levels of government. Twice the Council gave attention to a dispute over ownership of the commons between the town of Lewisham and a royal patentee. The Privy Council referred the problem to the local Justices, ordering them to hold a hearing.[29] An affair which had an indirect bearing on the aftermath of the Overbury murder also surfaced. The inquest into Overbury's death did not render its verdict to King's Bench because there was a jurisdictional dispute between the Lieutenant of the Tower and the City of London. This conflict over jurisdiction smoldered until the Privy Council created a commission to look into the matter.[30]

Much time was spent on the increase of the country's wealth and more specifically seeing that the wealth reached the right hands. On 1 June 1615, notice was given that on the next Tuesday, inequalities between imports and exports were to be debated and an expert, an auditor, was to be there.[31] This investigation came within days of the Council's giving their consent to the new and ultimately disastrous Cockayne Project for dyeing and dressing cloth.[32]

One of the most important issues to come before the Privy Council, and one which coincided with Carr's career at its high point, was this Project.[33] It was a plan whereby the dyeing and dressing of English cloth would take place in England instead of in the Low Countries. It was felt by some

in 1614 that this more fully manufactured product might add 50% to 100% of the export's value. Those in favor of this idea hoped to increase the value of exports and also wanted to increase employment and raise revenue by £40,000. The new company would supersede the old Merchant Adventurers, who had held the lion's share of the white or unfinished cloth export trade. It was hoped that capital from the Merchant Adventurers initially urged to participate, would go to the new company since the cloth industry in general needed large sums of long term investment and the new dyeing and dressing called for massive investment.

The Privy Council was not the only group that was skeptical of Cockayne's plan; the Merchant Adventurers rather than investing in the company that had replaced theirs, found investment opportunities elsewhere. "The new men used the project in an attempt to prise open the rich trade in undressed cloths, to secure a share in it by initially promising to finish all textiles exports and then persuading the former Adventurers to participate in a new division of the old trade."[34] When this did not happen, the Dutch also refused to compromise, and Cockayne was left to stumble on for three years. Although the resulting depression in the industry may have been inevitable, the problems the scheme caused the English in their continental markets hurt their trade for a long time.

Commercial ventures on a much smaller scale than the

Cockayne Project, and the question of who could or could not carry them out, often occupied the Privy Council's attention. The production of that extremely important commodity, glass,[35] as well as salt and sugar, figure prominently in such disputes. On 14 September 1614, notice was given for a new "invencion" for making bay and white salt. None were to hinder these inventors and his Majesty's officers were to help them.[36] This decision did not sit well with all concerned; five months later the Council was ready to make a decision on who should and who should not hold a patent on the manufacture of salt.[37]

Interlopers often made so much that they were at times almost astonishingly prepared to ignore the Privy Council's directives and threats. For example, in 1614 a man was said to be continuing glass manufacture after being told not to. The Council ordered his fire extinguished.[38] This incident was not isolated nor did those who lost money fail to complain. One patentee lost £1,000 to this competition, and the Privy Council ordered that the full amount lost should be paid to him by those who did not stop making glass.[39] Those who sought to continue manufacturing such things in spite of the patentees, offered arguments why they were not detrimental. The owner of a sugar-refining house in London submitted that he would lower prices, not break the laws, and offered a bond to that effect.[40]

The Privy Council was not behindhand in attempts to

halt the printing and circulation of undesirable writings. One case resulted in the author's being whipped.[41] A more humane disposition of a similar incident is to be found in April 1615 when William Martin repented for writing a history that was not liked and was given back his bond.[42]

Private matters, often of a minor sort, also came within the scope of this body. In June of 1615, Carr brought in a signed warrant to pay the king's barber £72.[43] A warrant for a much smaller amount, forty shillings, to pay for a doctor's lodgings is also noted.[44] A debtor's subterfuge whereby he planned to spend all his money and then go abroad instead of paying his great debts is outlined for the Council who were asked to stop him.[45] Twice, the personal affairs of the Venetian Ambassador surface. The first of these, from the spring of 1615, saw him attempting to unload a Flemish ship even though only the Levant or Turkey Company were allowed to.[46] Sir Julius Caesar and Sir Ralph Winwood were sent to examine and report back. A second and more unsavory example of the Ambassador's attempts to add to his wealth saw him ready to leave England without paying his debts. The decision of the Privy Council was that he was to be spoken to again and if no satisfaction was to be had, his goods were to be seized.[47]

When James turned his attention to the Council after the fall from grace of Salisbury, he stripped this body of its preeminent position. The Spanish Ambassador wrote in

1612 that James, "maketh little or noe account att all of his councillors and scarcely communicateth with them any thing of importance."[48] James felt that Robert Carr and himself could do a better job than the Council. Sarmiento writing in 1613 said, "The Viscount Rochester at the Council Table showeth much temper and modesty without seeming to press and sway anything. But afterward the King resolveth all business with him alone, both those that pass by the Council, and many others, wherewith he never maketh them acquainted."[49] The reason that James began to by-pass the Council was that its members, not surprisingly, offered differing advice on questions. This merely threw him into confusion.[50] Historians have rightly seen this circumventing of the Council for the advice of an intimate, as a retrograde step. It also shows the striking effects of bedchamber government.

The disastrous cloth experiment, and perhaps the similar but more successful creation of a glass-making monopoly, were the outstanding projects of these years. It may be presumed that the promoters gave Carr and other Councillors gifts. Occasionally there are tenuous connections of a more personal nature. Carr would have known Sir Robert Mansel, not least because of his own position at Rochester Castle and the projector's office in the Admiralty. Indeed before the 1614 Parliament it was, appropriately enough, Mansel who offered the favorite the nomination of one of

the M.P.s who would be returned for Rochester borough.[51] Even so, in these great matters, as for many lesser ones, there is no strong evidence that the Earl ever played a leading role or was induced by personal involvement or bribery to sponsor a project. With respect to cloth, he had indicated his support, but that did no more than underline the king's known position. Perhaps we can believe statements of both Cockayne and the king made in January 1616 at a time when it would have been easy to place some blame on Somerset's shoulders, that the only Councillor directly involved in the evolution of the cloth project was the Chief Justice, Sir Edward Coke.[52] A further caution is provided by the fact that a critical time for both these matters was the twelve months between the fall of 1614 and that of 1615. In this period, Somerset's intimacy with the king waned and eventually disappeared.

Nor is there evidence that Carr played any striking role with respect to that occasional institution, Parliament, and indeed the opportunities for any such display were limited quite apart from his handicap as a Scot. During the years of his influence there were but the two sessions of 1610 and the short, fruitless episode of 1614. However, on the latter occasion, it may be presumed, his comments in conversations with other peers would have been similar to the stances taken by Northampton and served to make it clear that the king would not countenance any great concessions of procedure or substance.

CARR AND PARLIAMENT

Robert Carr became involved with the 1610 Parliament when that body began an attack on the Scots. Behind the episode was a petition[53] or a scheme[54] to send the Scots back to their own realm. Notestein says that this "silly story" was probably the work of Carr and "doubtlessly designed to harden the heart of the King against Parliament."[55] D. H. Willson states that Carr had agents in the Commons and "may even have urged them to bring up delicate points in the hope of exasperating the King."[56] S. R. Gardiner says that when news of the anti-Scots petition reached Carr he "took alarm, and did all that he could to excite his master against the House."[57] James grew angry at this and said that he "would not accept the largest supply which it was in the power of the Commons to grant, if they 'were to sauce it with such taunts and disgraces as' had 'been uttered of him and those that' appertained to him."[58] James ordered the Speaker to adjourn the House. On 4 December 1610 Lake wrote to Salisbury that all the trouble had been stirred up by Carr, who was trying to "sow discord between the King and his Treasurer."[59] If that was the reason, Carr succeeded to a remarkable degree; "relations were never the same again between Cecil and the King."[60] James would slowly move to the point where he and Carr, in the experiment of bedchamber government, would replace Cecil.

The Parliament of 1614 saw Carr's power in full bloom. In contrast to the previous Parliament his influence was felt

not at the end but before it began. Sir Henry Neville,[61] a thorn in the king's side during 1610, saw that the projects[62] to raise money were merely causing antagonism in the land. Instead of the projects, he urged the recall and management of Parliament[63] whereby a complete program would be set out before the Lower House. This program would address the Common's grievances[64] and replenish the king's coffers at the same time. In return for this management, Neville sought the Secretaryship for himself and advancement for his friends.[65] The strongest original backers of Neville and his plan included Overbury, Carr, Suffolk, Pembroke, and Southampton. Excluding Suffolk, this group also wanted a foreign policy based on strong protestant alliances.[66] Seddon is probably wrong in saying Carr was seeking personal ascendency through this management of Parliament, for this misses the point that Carr was already ascendant and James was well into the phase of bedchamber government. Overbury was the group's biggest liability. He was arrogant to all concerned and even became embroiled in a fight with the man who had been his strongest ally, Pembroke.

Neville's hopes for the Secretaryship were dashed when his friends pushed his candidacy too hard. As well there was irritation of the "flocking of Parliament-men about him. They had their meetings and consultations with the Earl of Southampton and the Lord Sheffield at Lord Rochester's chamber."[67] James wanted nothing to do with this man who had so opposed him.

After Neville's eclipse, Carr supported Winwood[68] and Suffolk supported Lake.[69] The shaky alliance between Carr and Suffolk, which many feel was only started with Carr's marriage to Suffolk's daughter in December 1613, was made firmer when Suffolk switched his support to Winwood.[70]

Many have seen the important events leading up to the Parliament as Howard perfidy. The pro-Spanish Howards, especially Northampton, are given as the source of the rumors of a parliamentary undertaking.[71] These rumors, which Parliament eventually sought to get to the bottom of, occupied much of the Commons' time. The king's councillors were few in number, divided, and lacking in morale. The councillors could not divert the Lower House into more constructive courses. Bacon laid the blame for the "addled" nature of this Parliament on the shoulders of Northampton, who wanted to prove he was right about the futility of calling Parliament in the first place.[72] It was Northampton's agents who were behind Hoskyn's attack on the Scots, which culminated in a call for a night of the Sicilian Vespers.[73]

In June 1615 James was in an even worse financial predicament than he had been in in 1614. The Spanish faction, most notably Carr[74] and Suffolk, opposed calling Parliament for fear that war with Spain would be the price demanded for financial support. Moir also argues that Carr and Suffolk's plunder of the treasury would have been revealed.[75]

When Carr joined the Privy Council, in 1612, it is

doubtful if he added much more than the king's opinion to the debate. When "bedchamber government" started, the Privy Council was superseded by James and Carr, and the favorite's influence over policy greatly increased. Perhaps the highest point of his influence was when he conducted negotiations with the Spanish for an alliance in 1614-1615.[76]

CHAPTER IV - FOOTNOTES

[1]Cf., below, p. 110.

[2]Schreiber, Naunton, pp. 37-38.

[3]Cf., below, pp. 104-105.

[4]D. M. Loades, Politics and the Nation, 1450-1660 (London, 1974), p. 172. A detailed account and analysis of this body and its work during the previous reign is provided by Michael Barraclough Pulman, The Elizabethan Privy Council in the Fifteen-Seventies (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1971).

[5]E. M. Turner, The Cabinet Council of England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries (New York, 1970) p. 4.

[6]Aylmer, King's Servants, pp. 19, 13.

[7]Willson, Privy Councillors, p. 21.

[8]Russell, Crisis of Parliaments, p. 49.

[9]It is unfortunate that the most serious gap from 1540 in the Privy Council Registers, from January 1602 until May 1613, includes the first part of Carr's attendance. He joined in 1612.

[10]A.P.C., xxiii, p. 3. All of the following references to the Privy Council are drawn from times when Carr was present. This is very important since it often gives us our only look at questions he dealt with. This writer recognizes that the lists of names given at the top of entries in the printed Register may not be complete. However, it is the only coherent source. Furthermore, non-members were often present, specialists such as the Attorney General or second-rank administrators, and they might very well do most of the speaking.

[11]Ibid., xxxiv, p. 188, 1 June 1615.

[12]From uncited references in Willson, Privy Councillors, p. 17.

[13]A.P.C., xxxiii, pp. 667-668, 11 December 1614.

[14]Ibid., xxxiv, p. 228, 26 June 1615.

[15] A.P.C., xxxiv, p. 235, 30 June 1615, Carr 1 of 6.

[16] Ibid., xxxiii, p. 487, 6 July 1614, Carr 1 of 17.

[17] Ibid., xxxiv, p. 195, 9 June 1615, Carr 1 of 15.

[18] Ibid., xxxiii, p. 146, 22 July 1613, Carr 1 of 7.

[19] Ibid., xxxiii, p. 456, 7 June 1614, Carr 1 of 15.

[20] A.P.C., xxxiv, pp. 211-12, 19 June 1615, Carr 1 of 7.

[21] Ibid., xxxii, p. 315, 31 December 1613, Carr 1 of 5.

[22] Ibid., xxxiii. One of these was for the Ambassador to Russia, p. 470, the other was for the Lieutenant Governor of Brill, p. 567.

[23] Ibid., xxxiii, p. 39, 24 March 1613/1614.

[24] A.P.C., xxxiv, p. 129, 28 April 1615, Carr 1 of 6.

[25] Ibid., xxxiv, p. 295, 30 September 1615, Carr 1 of 6.

[26] Ibid., xxxiii, pp. 459-460, 8/9 June 1614, Carr 1 of 17.

[27] Ibid., xxxiii, p. 203, 25 September 1613, Carr 1 of 10.

[28] A.P.C., xxxiii, p. 315, 28 December 1613, Carr 1 of 10.

[29] Ibid., xxxiv, pp. 117, 205, 18 April 1615, 18 June 1615, Carr 1 of 12 and 1 of 14.

[30] Ibid., xxxiv, pp. 252-253, 9 June 1615, Carr 1 of 17.

[31] A.P.C., xxxiv, p. 188, 1 June 1615, Carr 1 of 11. This was when James was again hard pressed to find ready cash.

[32] Ibid., xxxiv, pp. 211-12, 19 June 1615, Carr 1 of 14.

[33] Named after the Alderman who promoted its adoption. This paragraph is based on the best recent account, B. E. Supple, Commercial Crises and Change in England, 1600-1642 (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 33-51.

[34] Supple, Commercial Crisis, p. 37.

[35] Glass ranked only behind cloth and leather in terms of importance. Starting in 1612, the method of production changed from wood to coal-fired furnaces.

In January 1615, Sir Robert Mansell, Vice-Admiral of the Narrow Seas, obtained sole possession of the patent for coal-fired production. In the same year, 1615, James proclaimed that this was the only method to be employed. DNB. S. Jack, Trade and Industry in Tudor and Stuart England (London, 1977), pp. 90-93.

[36] A.P.C., xxxiii, p. 567, 14 September 1616, Carr 1 of 8.

[37] Ibid., xxxiv, p. 67, 27 February 1615, Carr 1 of 14.

[38] A.P.C., xxxiii, p. 574, 30 September 1614, Carr 1 of 13.

[39] Ibid., xxxiv, p. 15, 13 January 1614/15, Carr 1 of 13.

[40] Ibid., xxxiv, p. 283, 3 September 1615, Carr 1 of 6.

[41] Ibid., xxxiv, p. 285, 23 September 1615, Carr 1 of 7. This seems to run contrary to G. R. Elton, who says the Privy Council had no judicial function. Elton, Tudor Constitution, p. 102.

[42] A.P.C., xxxiv, p. 99, 5 April 1615, Carr 1 of 12.

[43] Ibid., xxxiv, p. 223, 25 June 1615, Carr 1 of 6.

[44] Ibid., xxxiii, p. 661, 15 December 1614, Carr 1 of 5.

[45] Ibid., xxxiv, p. 1, 4 January 1614/15, Carr 1 of 6.

[46] Ibid., xxxiv, p. 174, 26 May 1615, Carr 1 of 14.

[47] Ibid., xxxiv, p. 291, 26 September 1615., Carr 1 of 18.

[48] Willson, Privy Councillors, p. 18, [no ref. is given].

[49] Ibid., p. 18.

[50] Ibid., p. 15.

[51] William M. Mansell, An Historical and Genealogical Account of the Ancient Family of Maunsell-Mansell-Mansel (London, 1850), p. 73. I owe this reference to Professor W. J. Jones.

[52] Astrid Friis, Alderman Cockayne's Project and the Cloth Trade (Copenhagen and London, 1927), pp. 288-91, 463-66.

[53] E. Foster, Proceedings in Parliament 1610, 2 vols. (New Haven, 1966), ii, p. 346.

[54]Notestein, Commons, p. 39.

[55]Ibid., p. 39.

[56]Willson, Privy Councillors, p. 128.

[57]Gardiner, England, ii, p. 109.

[58]Ibid., ii, p. 109.

[59]Foster, Proceedings, ii, p. 346.

[60]Notestein, Commons, p. 39.

[61]Sir Henry Neville (c. 1564-1615). He was a former Ambassador to France and later implicated in Essex's plot.

[62]These largely unsuccessful projects included the sale of hunting licences and a tax on the interest gained from loans. See Dietz, Finance, ii, pp. 146-149.

[63]For Neville's plan to undertake to manage the House for James and Bacon's to pack it, see Clayton Roberts and Duncan Owen, "The Parliamentary Undertaking of 1614," English Historical Review 93 (1979), pp. 491-498.

[64]These were most notably impositions which were Customs duties or payments over and above the normal schedule of rates authorized by Parliament.

[65]This was left in Carr's hands. Roberts, "Undertaking," p. 487.

[66]Seddon, "Robert Carr," p. 53.

[67]Willson, Privy Councillors, p. 137.

[68]Roberts and Owen, "Undertaking," p. 488.

[69]Seddon, "Robert Carr," p. 63.

[70]Ibid., p. 64. For proof that Carr was the stronger member of this alliance see p. 37.

[71]Spedding, Bacon, v, p. 182. T. Moir, The Addled Parliament of 1614 (Oxford, 1958), pp. 108-109.

[72]Seddon, "Robert Carr," p. 65.

[73]The Sicilian Vespers referred to a general massacre of the French in 1282. Hoskyns said that Carr had promised to speak to the king in favor of releasing him from prison but spoke against him. L. Osborn, The Life Letters and Writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638 (New Haven, 1937), p. 75. Linda Levy Peck in her article "Northampton, A Reformer?" has attempted to reassess Northampton's career. He may have been interested in reforms but only if they did not affect his own considerable financial gain. Northampton has been harshly dealt with, but to show he was not all treachery does not prove that he was the complete opposite.

[74]For Carr and the Spanish alliance see Chapter VI.

[75]Moir, Parliament, p. 153.

[76]See below pp. 132, 138.

CHAPTER V

CARR AND PATRONAGE

JACOBEAN OFFICE HOLDING

Jacobean office holding, while not always a spectacular means of enrichment, was open to all levels of seeker and did pay bountiful returns. The competition for these offices, of course, was commensurate with their status, powers, and rewards. While most of these offices at the top had a good deal of work attached to them, the middle and lower levels were quite different. Some of these posts were sinecures and others with duties could be farmed out to deputies. The few at the top of the system who came to wield tremendous power, and even those below them, treated their offices almost like private fiefdoms. This was the heyday of the doctrine that office could be construed as freehold. Not only were many offices sold to the best candidate in terms of experience or potential and the highest bidder but the reversion or right of succession to an office or place after the death or retirement of the holder was sold as well. Many would argue that the greatest officials, or indeed the crown itself, should endeavour to recover this lost patronage.

The key to this whole system was the king, who knew and hand-picked those in the highest strata, such as the Chamberlain or Treasurer of the Household.[1] This gave the sovereign a large measure of control over the upper echelon of government. Not only were the most powerful in closer proximity to the king's watchful eye; their tenure, unlike that of their underlings, was often durante bene placito regis

or during the king's pleasure. It was the high officials as well as the king's favorites and family that helped him choose among the competitors for lesser office.[2] There was a fortune to be made in the scramble for place for those with the influence to deliver on their promises, and those few, such as Carr,[3] usually could.

The top members of the Jacobean system and the power they held over appointments led to a process much like subinfeudation, whereby the immediate inferiors whom they had chosen could play a large part in the choice of candidates for still more inferior positions. Those at the top often became more interested in building factions and having their palms greased than giving disinterested advice. It was felt that one could not be too obsequious in the quest for favor. This gave the court an amoral, rotten tone, but this had been true for years before the start of James's reign. Such negative publicity was not compensated for materially since the crown was not given a fair share of the money which changed hands. Success in being placed in office by a great man was a weather-vane for other suitors, and the powerful such as Carr became more powerful until monopoly of power was the only aim.[4] There was an aspect beyond securing the spoils in all of this since factions grew around the great, and gradually competing advice on weighty affairs of state was given.

CARR'S PATRONAGE AND OFFICE HOLDING

CARR'S UNDERLINGS

One of the most important of Salisbury's positions which James had to fill was that of Lord Treasurer.[5] This was not only a first class position in terms of power, it was also very profitable. Although it had fees attached of only £365 per annum and £15 livery,[6] it was estimated in 1621 as having a capital value of £20,000 and an annual value of £7,000-£14,000.[7] James's original intention was much like his intention for the secretaryship, to hold the position in abeyance. The Venetian Ambassador, Antonio Foscarini, wrote in June 1612 that "The Lord Treasurership is not yet filled up, and it seems that the King is thinking of putting it into Commission among four Ministers, Pembroke, Northampton, Rochester and Sir Julius Caesar...."[8] This plan was eventually carried out; however, in January 1613 Chamberlain noted that the world was of the opinion that Carr was shooting at the Lord Treasurer's place but was "slowe every way as well as for himself as his friends."[9] Carr actually wanted this very important position to go to his friend the Earl of Northampton. It was noted that Northampton had opposition for the job and in order for him to succeed, "Rochester must charge and Suffolk will second."[10] The position eventually went to Suffolk after Northampton's death.

One of Salisbury's former posts and one of the half dozen most valuable in the kingdom was the Mastership of the

Court of Wards and Liveries. The office took responsibility for the king's role as feudal overlord and was most often carried out to the profit of all concerned except the ward. Although criticism of it died off to some extent after 1614,[11] it was considered a grievance of the first magnitude throughout the period. The country as a whole, and the aristocracy in particular, would have been outraged if the Mastership had gone to an expensive, foreign favorite such as Carr. Francis Bacon solicited the favorite for the position[12] but it went initially to a former Ambassador to France, Sir George Carew. Chamberlain felt Carew may have been chosen because of Carr's influence.[13] James's intention to keep the power, and more importantly the revenue, was well known to Carew. In his office-taking speech he said, "His Majesty meaneth to be as it were Master of the Wards himself, and those whom he useth are to be but his substitutes and move wholly by his impulsion and within the circle of his own motion."[14] Carew died shortly, as did his successor, Sir Walter Cope, who was replaced by Sir William Knollys.[15]

The underlings who carried out Carr's duties were part of a large network which he used to help fulfill his sundry formal and informal duties.[16] Since even a portion of the vast amount of work involved in his many positions would have made all but a Salisbury balk, many came to work under him. In addition to such previously mentioned recipients of Carr's aid as Overbury, Winwood, Northampton, Suffolk, Carew, and Neville, many others had cause to be

thankful. John Packer, Carr's secretary after 1612[17] and the future secretary of the Duke of Buckingham, Bacon,[18] Cotton,[19] Cottington,[20] Trumbull,[21] Cranfield,[22] Lake,[23] and Chapman the poet[24] all worked for Carr.

CARR'S ROLE IN THE CHOICE OF SECRETARY

Bedchamber government might have continued in its first form for a long while had it not been for the financial needs of the crown and the exhaustion of those projects short of calling a Parliament. As the calling of a Parliament became more and more certain, the decision to choose a permanent Principal Secretary in name at least changed from being important to being crucial.

Every political group at court, including the queen and prince,[25] the united Howards, the "patriots," had a candidate for Secretary. Robert Carr initially supported Sir Henry Neville,[26] the former Ambassador to France, a man whose strong suit was said to be his standing with the House of Commons.[27] The king killed this candidacy in its embryonic stage by saying, "he will not have a Secretary imposed on him by Parliament."[28]

The most important opinion on the choice of Secretary was, of course, that of the king. As early as 7 January 1613 Chamberlain could write to Carleton saying that for Secretary the king's "inclination holdes firme for our friend...."[29] Winwood was indeed one of the two most serious candidates for this office but he lacked parliamentary experience.[30] This made him a bit of an unknown quantity to both Pembroke and Suffolk and hence less galling but also less effective. Winwood's candidacy was slow but steady. In December 1612 Isaac Wake had written to Carleton that Winwood was "gaining ground."[31] There is some doubt as to

when it was that Carr threw his support behind Winwood, the eventual winner. D. H. Willson says it was some time in 1614,[32] although it was known by Chamberlain in January of that year. Thomas Lake and Winwood were the last two candidates and the court supporters of both fell into a quarrel over who would prevail. Suffolk, Carr's future father-in-law, was the champion of Lake and Somerset of Winwood. When it came to putting pressure on the king, the favorite easily won. "My Lord of Somerset hath so great a power of prevailing with the king as never any man had the like, otherwise you would have judged it almost impossible that Sir Ralph could have been brought into that place...."[34]

On 29 March 1614, only seven days before the opening of Parliament, Winwood was appointed Secretary of State, a position he held until his death in 1617. Winwood's tenure under Carr was to be a good deal less than autonomous:

> but the world thinketh that he hath no cause to take any great comfort in his new preferment in respect that the authority thereof is so much abridged as it is by the keeping of the signet seals from him, the now allowing him to have the packets directed unto him which come from foreign parts, the not permitting him to be styled by the title of principal secretary of state but only secretary of state.[35]

It must have seemed to Winwood for the first nine months of 1615 that the game had not been worth the candle nor his £7,000 bribe to Carr.[36] For these nine months, dispatches were sent to the king or Carr, who passed on copies and

covering letters to Winwood. This insulting state of affairs was slowly rectified and the reception of dispatches became more equal between the three.[37] Winwood would live to repay Carr's slight by starting the process which ended in the trials for Overbury's murder.

CHAPTER V - FOOTNOTES

[1]The spectacular financial gains from office holding went to the officials such as these.

[2]Most of the money that was siphoned from the crown was taken at the middle levels.

[3]One letter giving typical information says this about an appointment: "This is the work only of my Lord of Somerset." H.M.C. Downshire, iv, p. 363.

[4]James in a letter rebuking Carr and his father-in-law, Suffolk, for being all powerful, said, "Do not ye two (as it waire) hedge in all the court with a manner of necessitie to depende upone you?" Archaeologia, xli, p. 85, 29 December 1615.

[5]A.G.R. Smith says that William Paulet, first Marquess of Winchester restored the Exchequer to a place of supremacy under Elizabeth. "Winchester was the first of the line of Lord Treasurers who were not only in practical terms ministers of finance and thus key figures in the whole administrative system, but also, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, often chief ministers of the Crown as well." A. G. R. Smith, The Government of Elizabethan England (London, 1967), p. 52.

[6]Sir Joseph Banks, ed., "A true Collection as well of all the Kinges Majesties Offices and Fees in any of the Courtes at Westminister, as of all the Offices and Fees of his Majesties honorable Household; together with all Fees apertaineing to Captaines and Souldiers, having charge of Castles, Bullwarkes, and Fortresses within the Realme of England (Anno 1605)," Archaeologia, xi, p. 76.

[7]Aylmer, King's Servants, p. 221.

[8]C.S.P. Venice, 1610-1613, p. 376, June 1612.

[9]Chamberlain Letters, ii, p. 401.

[10]H.M.C. Portland, ix, p. 39.

[11]J. P. Kenyon, ed., The Stuart Constitution (Cambridge, 1966), pp. 61-62. See generally, H. E. Bell, An Introduction to the History and Records of the Court of Wards and Liveries (Cambridge, 1953).

[12] C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 155.

[13] Chamberlain Letters, i, pp. 357-358. It was more likely Ellesmere's influence although Carr probably supported the candidature. Baron Ellesmere was Thomas Egerton (c. 1540-1617).

[14] Willson, James I, p. 333.

[15] Bell, Court of Wards, p. 19.

[16] These positions were much too important to farm them out to deputies. Even Buckingham would not have dared to execute a major office by deputy. Aylmer, King's Servants, p. 126.

[17] Packer's father was clerk of the Privy Seal to Elizabeth. Packer was sent by King James as his agent to the King of Denmark. He was made Secretary for the French tongue. Ninth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, p. 387a.

[18] John Chamberlain writing about Francis Bacon's refusal to allow anyone help him pay for a masque at Carr's wedding said, "his obligations are such as well to his Majestie as to the great Lord [Carr], and to the whole house of Howards as he can admit no partners. Chamberlain Letters, i, p. 493. Bacon, as Attorney-General, would take a major role against the favorite at his trial.

[19] Sir Robert Cotton (1571-1631). His biographer calls Cotton a client of Carr. He also helped the favorite, at times illegally, before, during, and after the arrest for murder. K. Sharpe, Sir Robert Cotton (Oxford, 1979), pp. 64, 127-136.

[20] Francis Cottington (c. 1578-1652). As Clerk extraordinary he was assigned to Carr's office. M. Havran, Caroline Courtier, The Life of Lord Cottington (Columbia, S.C. 1973), p. 42.

[21] Carr went to "deal" with the king for Trumbull in October 1613. H.M.C. Downshire, iv, p. 233.

[22] Lionel Cranfield (1575-1645). Northampton said Cranfield shrouded himself "under the grace of swete Rochester." C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 193.

[23] When Lake got a seat on the Privy Council it was said, "This is the work only of my Lord of Somerset...." H.M.C. Downshire, iv, p. 363.

[24]George Chapman (c. 1559-1634). Prince Henry was the former patron of Chapman. In 1614 Chapman dedicated 'Odysses' to Carr. The work dealing directly with Carr's career was the play, "The tragedy of Chabot Admiral of France." T. M. Parrot, ed., The Plays of George Chapman, The Tragedies, i, (New York, 1961), pp. 275-337. This play is a topical allegory which shows a just subject in conflict with a selfish king. It blames the hero's fall on unjust treatment and the envy of factions. See E. Rees, The Tragedies of George Chapman, Renaissance Ethics in Action (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), pp. 156-183.

[25]"The Quene and the Prince are earnest in Sir H. Wottons behalfe...." Chamberlain Letters, ii, p. 359.

[26]Carr's support for Neville must be looked at in terms of his political orientation at this time because much of his advice came from Sir Thomas Overbury, a friend of the "patriot" party.

[27]Evans, Secretary, p. 66.

[28]Earl of Dorset to Edmondes, quoted in Willson, Privy Councillors, p. 137.

[29]Sir Ralph Winwood. Chamberlain Letters, ii, p. 401.

[30]He was a former Ambassador to France.

[31]C.S.P. Dom., 1611-1618, p. 161.

[32]Willson, Privy Councillors, p. 137.

[33]Chamberlain Letters, ii, p. 500.

[34]H.M.C. Downshire, iv, p. 385.

[35]Ibid., p. 385.

[36]See p. 53.

[37]Evans, Secretary, p. 70. James was later to say that he had never been better served than between 1612-1614. Ibid., p. 73.

CHAPTER VI

THE FALL OF CARR

When Carr became Lord Chamberlain, in July 1614, he was at the height of his power. His many offices, and other offices whose holders he helped choose, made him the most powerful of James's courtiers and allowed him the role of great patron. Carr's marriage into and connections with the Howard family insured that their faction would be the dominant one at court. The favorite's titles gave him prestige and his mainly-unearned gains made him one of the richest men in the kingdom. Carr achieved and maintained his dominance solely through the favor he enjoyed from the king.

Each higher stage that Carr reached added to the list of those who opposed him. In addition to those who merely wanted to replace Carr's good fortune with their own was a group, the "patriots," who hated and feared Carr's increasingly pro-Spanish stance. The nominal leader of this group, Pembroke, also felt that he, not Carr, should have become Lord Chamberlain.

Events surrounding the 1614 Parliament and its aftermath were the catalyst that forced the "patriots" to oppose Carr directly. The favorite, in league with the Howards, had attempted to block the calling of the 1614 Parliament, an act which angered the "patriots." Carr must have relished the collapse of this Parliament, in June 1614, because it left the "patriots" without the pro-protestant foreign policy they desired. The failure of this Parliament also

left the king without the money he had expected. James, who was ready to investigate almost any avenue in his search for cash, was led to believe that an alliance with Spain could solve his financial problems. The alliance, to be negotiated by Carr, and solidified by the marriage of Prince Charles and a Spanish Infanta, would have made the Anglo-Spanish combination the arbiters of Europe. Had it taken place, the marriage would also have enraged the sensibilities of the English as much as or more than any other royal marriage in history.[1] The single group most opposed to the scheme of alliance and marriage was the "patriots."

As long as Carr could count on his prop, the king, the "patriots" seemed to pose no threat to his career. In a shrewd but dangerous move they struck at Carr through James's weakness, his love of favorites. Determined to replace Carr, the "patriots" held a meeting at Baynards Castle[2] and decided to introduce a new beauty to the king. James, on a progress through Northamptonshire in August 1614, met the candidate of the "patriots," George Villiers. The beautiful and well-mannered twenty-two year old was taken to court by his backers and the jostling between old and new favorites began. On the 4th of November 1614, Villiers' fortunes were said to be at a stand because he was blocked from a position in the bedchamber by Carr. However, in December 1614,[3] James took delight in showing off his new plaything at a court masque.[4]

Carr had a secure relationship with the king but the old favorite's reaction to the introduction of the new favorite alienated James and played into the hands of the Villiers faction. When James refused to terminate his fledgling affair with Villiers, the unsavory side of Carr's personality surfaced. Carr's behavior towards James became more stormy and more demanding. He allowed the king no peace and no escape from the outbursts. In a remarkable letter from the end of 1615, after Carr was accused of murder but before his trial, James set out the reasons for his unhappiness with Carr. The king wrote of his sadness over the deterioration in their physical relationship, for Carr had gone so far as to refuse to sleep with James. The king had unsuccessfully begged the favorite to return to sleeping in the royal bedroom, "I leave out of this reckoning your withdrawing yourself from lying in my chamber, notwithstanding my many hundred times earnestly soliciting you to the contrary."[5] The letter continued with an indictment of Carr's behavior:

> especially of late since the strange phrenzy took you, so powdered and mixed with strange streams of unquietness, passion, fury and insolent obstinancy, as it chokes and obscures all these excellent and good parts that God hath bestowed upon you. Even to rebuke me more sharply and bitterly than ever my master durst do, yet, to invent a new act of railing at me -- nay, to borrow the tongue of the devil -- in comparison whereof all Peacham's book is but a gentle admonition, that cannot come within the compass of any liberty of friendship.[6]

Carr also seemed to want to grieve the king by moving his complaints at "unseasonable hours" and by his "dogged sullen behavior." The heart of the king's complaint was that "worse than any other thing that can be imagined, you have in many of your mad fits, done what you can to persuade me that you mean not so much to hold me by love as by awe, and that you have me so far in your reverence as that I dare not offend you or resist your appetites. I told you twyce or thryce that you might lead me by the hairt and not by the nose."[7]

James, in his letter to Carr, made it quite clear why Carr was so unhappy:

> First I tak God the searcher of all hairts to recorde that in all the time past of ydle talk I never knew, nor could out of anie observation of myne find anie appearance of anie such court faction as ye have apprehended; and so farre was I ever from overseeing or indirectlie feeding of it (if I had apprehendit it), as I protest to God I would have runne upon it with my feete, as upone fir, to have extinguished it, if I could have seene anie sparkle of it.[8]

Perhaps more striking than the king's intentional blindness about the conspiracy was James's willingness to continue his relationship with a "reformed" Carr despite the fact that the latter had been accused of murder:

> Hold me thus by the hairt; ye may build upone my favour as upone a rokke that never shall feall you, that never shall wearie to give newe demonstration of my affection towards you; nay, that shall

> never suffer anie to ryse in anie degree of my favour, except they may acknowledge and thank you as a further of it; and that I may be persuadit in my hairt that they love and honour you for my saik (not that any living ever shall come to the twentie degree of your favour).[9]

James had given him every opportunity to change but Carr continued to be his own worst enemy. By 23 April 1615, James had made an extremely important decision about the future of his two favorites by knighting Villiers and making him a Gentleman of the Bedchamber.

It may or may not be mere coincidence that Carr's private misfortunes were added to by political misfortunes. Politically he was dealt a grave blow in the early part of 1615 after negotiations with the Spanish were reopened. Digby, in a carefully worded dispatch to James in March 1615, completely undercut Carr's position by accusing the favorite of showing documents to the Spanish and exceeding his instructions.[10] The king was so angry that for a time he turned his back on the Spanish match, and Carr's negotiations were discontinued. It was prophetic that at the end of July 1615, Carr could neither obtain the position of Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports for himself nor the position of Lord Privy Seal for his candidate.[11]

By the winter of 1614-1615, and after Villiers' career had been successfully launched, rumors spread that there was something mysterious about the manner in which Sir Thomas Overbury had died.[12] He was an early friend to and

advisor of Carr; he also shared the goals of the "patriots." Overbury was manoeuvred into a position of either accepting an embassy abroad or being imprisoned, because both his former friend, Carr, and the king wanted him away from court. He was hated by the king and queen for his insolent behavior towards them. Overbury became hated by Carr because he very much opposed Carr's plan to marry Frances Howard. The unfortunate young man was sent to the Tower in April 1613, where he died from poison in September of the same year. By July 1615 Winwood had received reports that the cause of death was murder and by the end of that month Chief Justice Coke had evidence implicating the favorite and his wife.[13]

On 17 October 1615 Robert and Frances Carr were accused of murdering Sir Thomas Overbury. Their trials were held on 24 and 25 May 1616. Frances pleaded guilty.[14] Robert faced a court composed of personal and political enemies[15] yet maintained his innocence. Despite his defence he was found guilty,[16] on circumstantial evidence, amidst rejoicing on all sides. Carr and his wife were sent to the Tower for seven years and then banished to Chiswick. She was pardoned in 1616 and died in 1632 and he was pardoned in 1624 and died in 1645.

Arthur Wilson described Carr after leaving the Tower as, "living in a private, and almost obscure condition."[17] Almost all notices we have of him after his imprisonment deal with his finances. His strange, futile letters to the

king were mainly pleas for financial enlargement.[18] Few noticed his death and fewer lamented.

CHAPTER VI - FOOTNOTES

[1]K. Van Eerde, The Spanish Match through an English Protestant's Eyes," Huntington Library Quarterly (1968-1969), pp. 59-75. Londoners showed their feelings by trying to burn down Sarmiento's house. Havran, Cottington, p. 42.

[2]This was a London house of the Earl of Pembroke. White, Cast of Ravens, p. 89.

[3]Ibid., pp. 90-91.

[4]Lockyer, Buckingham, p. 18.

[5]Matter, My Lords and Lady, Appendix F, p. 330. Uncited but taken from J. Halliwell, ed., Letters of the Kings of England, ii (London, 1846). This letter was written 29 December 1615.

[6]Ibid., p. 329.

[7]Matter, My Lords and Lady, p. 331.

[8]Ibid., p. 328.

[9]Ibid., p. 331.

[10]Spedding, Bacon, v, p. 232. Digby was the Ambassador to Spain and against an Anglo-Spanish alliance. His dispatch to James was a very brave act that might have been motivated by the religious and political principles he shared with his fellow "patriots." It is more likely Digby knew that Carr was too impotent to retaliate. If the latter is the case we can date Carr's actual fall as some time before March 1615.

[11]Thomas Bilson (1546-1616). He had been added to the Commission to make sure Frances Howard could obtain a nullity in October 1613.

[12]White, Cast of Ravens, p. 100.

[13]Lockyer, Buckingham, p. 23.

[14]She was so unchanged by her experiences that she offered Villiers a £20,000 bribe in exchange for a pardon. S. R. Gardiner, "On Certain Letters of Diego Sarmiento de Acuna, Count of Gondomar, Giving an Account of the Affair of the Earl of Somerset, with

Remarks on the Career of Somerset as a Public Man," Archaeologia, xli, p. 179.

[15]Almost every one of the Peers would fit this category.

[16]Carr was probably right to say, "I fell, rather for want of well defending, then by the violence or force of any proofs...." Cabala, p. 2.

[17]A. Wilson, History, p. 83.

[18]Cabala, pp. 1-5.

CONCLUSION

Robert Carr, because of his appearance, was chosen by James as a favorite in 1607. For the next four years, Carr was restrained from rapidly advancing in material gain, honors, and power. The largest impediment to advancement was the king's great minister, Salisbury. It was fortunate for the favorite that he was given so long to study the ways and people of the court and to become steeped in James's public and private opinions.

When Salisbury died, the king began to rule more directly, and with the help of Carr, embarked upon the experiment that has come to be known as "bedchamber government." James's plan to take over the duties of Salisbury was based on dreams not on facts. He greatly overestimated his own capacity for sustained hard work and Carr's limited abilities. When James tired of personal control and returned to more pleasant diversions, an increased load of work fell on Carr's shoulders. From all evidence, Carr seems to have been industrious; however, he was overextended. The favorite sat on the Privy Council, was Treasurer of Scotland, acted as Secretary of State, Lord Privy Seal, and Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports as well as being named Lord Lieutenant of Durham. The duties connected with these offices called for a Salisbury not a Carr.

The favorite had much more to do than the work associated with office and maintaining a private life with James. The king, by his show of confidence in and favor

towards Carr, made him the "channel" for those hundreds of subjects with suits. The most important consequence was that Carr achieved tremendous indirect control over office holding and policy. Those who wanted to use Carr's aid swelled in number until a powerful faction was fashioned. This faction, coupled with the one that had grown around his father-in-law, Suffolk, came to dominate the court. In opposition were those whom Carr could not or would not help plus a politically motivated group who feared Carr's increasingly pro-Spanish stance.

Carr's most serious weakness was that he proved to be something less than a brilliant thinker. As long as Carr, in executing his offices and determining which suits should go forward, had merely to reflect the opinions of the king, his knowledge stood him in good stead. Beyond such essentially clerical duties, Carr brought no new ideas to increase the efficiency of government. Nor is there any evidence that his role as position holder was more than a stop-gap. While Carr cannot be accused of allowing any position in his control to deteriorate, more able men could have filled these positions. He cannot even be given complete credit for the outstanding men who worked under him, for most of them would have risen with or without the favorite's presence in government. No solutions to the king's political and financial problems came from the favorite's quarter. Carr's effect with reference to Parliament was to drive a wedge

between this important body and the king. James's most pressing problem, lack of money, was actually exacerbated by the favorite. When he did try to help James with cash, Carr merely emphasized his part in the problem. Carr tried to reach beyond his abilities: "previously in England the favorites had been privados, now a favorite sought to become a politico."[1]

Carr's lack of ability in guiding his own fortunes forced him into the arms of advisors. The first of these, Sir Thomas Overbury, convinced the favorite to join the "patriots." Carr's adherence to this group was an absurd course of action. When it became obvious that his career would stall unless he abandoned the "patriots," Carr switched to Northampton for advice. A more personal reason for the change in advisors was Carr's love match with Frances Howard. Overbury strongly opposed any dealings with the Howards and he was well aware of the scandal which would result from the divorce between Frances and the Earl of Essex. Public knowledge that Frances, and possibly Carr himself, had murdered Overbury sealed the favorite's fate after he had fallen. The change in advisors brought the favorite into line with the king's thinking, but it also angered Carr's former friends so much that it became obvious that at the first opportunity they would try to destroy him.

The death of Northampton, in June 1614, left Carr to his own devices, and without the advice he would increasingly

need. Carr's fortunes were at their zenith and he appeared to be solidly entrenched both as a public figure and as the object of the king's affections. The favorite's reaction to the threat presented by the introduction of George Villiers was panic. Perhaps Carr, as a lover of the king, reacted in the jealous, irrational fashion not unknown to the spurned. When James refused to protect Carr from the conspirators and their vehicle, Villiers, it may be that the former favorite could not rise above his bitterness. Northampton probably would have counselled Carr to strengthen his already firm standing with the king and covertly attack Villiers and his fellows. Carr, lacking good advice, became arrogant and peevish. The once-mighty favorite continued to be intransigent but James was determined not to be bullied and withdrew his support, an act that caused the favorite's fall. In the final analysis Carr cannot be blamed for the debacle that was his career; he merely played the cards he had been dealt. It was James's fault for choosing Carr and raising the young man beyond the level of his competence.

The king did not extract what could have been a valuable lesson from Carr's career. After having his regime tainted by one over-mighty subject, James started on a similar but more pronounced course with another. The new favorite, unlike Carr, never forgot that everything except his life was owed to the king. Villiers proved himself to be more able, more intelligent, and much less in need of advice than

Carr. The new favorite became much richer and more honored than James's previous protege. Villiers dominated the court much more completely and rigorously than any previous courtier. Villier's control over foreign policy make Carr's attempts in this area look feeble in comparison. Unlike Carr, Villiers became almost unassailable as both privado and politico. Whatever function James may have expected of a politico-favorite Carr showed that he never really had the abilities to fulfil it.

CONCLUSION - FOOTNOTES

[1]Seddon, "Robert Carr," p. 51.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LIST OF WORKS CITED

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

Acts of the Privy Council of England. Edited by J. R. Dasent. 46 vols. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1890-1964.

Aiken, L. Memoirs of the Court of King James I. 2 vols. 3rd ed. London: Longman, Hurst, etc., 1823.

Ashton, R. ed. James I, By his Contemporaries: An Account of his Career and Character as Seen by Some of his Contemporaries. London: Hutchinson, 1969.

Banks, Sir Joseph. "A true Collection as well of all the Kinges Majesties Offices and Fees in any of the Courtes at Westminister, as of all the Offices and Fees of his Majesties honorable Household; together with all Fees apertaineing to Captaines and Souldiers, having charge of Castles, Bullwarkes, and Fortresses within the Realme of England (Anno L605)." Archaeologia xv (1812), 72-83.

Birch, T. ed. The Works of Sir Walter Raleigh, Now First Collected: To Which are Prefixed the Lives of the Author. 8 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929; reprinted ed., New York: Burt Franklin, 1964.

Cabala, Mysteries of State, in Letters of the Great Ministers of K. James and K. Charles. Faithfully collected by a Noble Hand. London: [n.a., n.p.].

Collier, J. ed. The Egerton Papers: A Collection of Public and Private Documents, Chiefly Illustrative of the Times of Elizabeth and James I. London: Camden Society Publications, 1840.

Elton, G. R. ed. The Tudor Constitution; Documents and Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Goodman, G. The Court of King James the First. ed. J. S. Brewer. 2 vols. London: R. Bentley, 1839.

Halliwell, J. O., ed. The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart., During the Reigns of James I and Charles I. 2 vols. London: Richard Bentley, 1845.

Historical Manuscripts Commission. Bath MSS: Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath. vol. 2. Edited by S. Lomas. Dublin: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1907.

_____. DeL'Isle and Dudley MSS: Report on the Manuscripts of The Right Honourable Viscount De L'Isle. vol. 5, 1611-1626. Edited by W. Shaw and G. Owen. London. Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1962.

_____. Downshire MSS: Report on the Manuscripts of The Marquess of Downshire. vol. 3, 1611-1612. Edited by A. B. Hinds. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1938.

_____. Downshire MSS: Papers of William Trumbull, the Elder. vol, 4, 1613-1614. Edited by A. B. Hinds. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1940.

_____. Hatfield MSS: Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury. Part xix, 1607. Edited by M. S. Giuseppi and D. Lockie. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1965.

_____. Hatfield MSS: Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury. Part xx, 1608. Edited by G. Dyfnallt Owen. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1968.

_____. Earl of Marr and Kellie MSS: Supplementary Report on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Mar and Kellie. Edited by Rev. H. Paton. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1930.

_____. Ninth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1883.

_____. Duke of Portland MSS: Report on the Manuscripts of His Grace The Duke of Portland, K.G. vol. 9 London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1923.

Kenyon, J. P. ed. The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688: Documents and Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Larkin, J. F. and Hughes, P. L. Stuart Royal Proclamations. Volume I: Royal Proclamations of King James I 1603-1625. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Lysons, S. "Original Papers Addressed to King James I and King Charles I on the Subject of the Duke of Buckingham, and Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset." Archaeologia xvii (1814) 280-289.

McClure, N. E., ed. The Letters of John Chamberlain. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939.

Molyneux, J. M. "A Message from King James I to the Earl of Somerset in the Case of Sir Thomas Overbury, Sent on the 29th of December, 1615, Through Sir George More Lieutenant of the Tower." Archaeologia xli (1867), 75-79.

Osborne, F. Traditionall Memoyres on the Raigne of King James. London: [n.p.], 1658.

Peyton, E. The Divine Catastrophe of the Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts. London: [n.p.], 1652.

Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series of the Reign of James I. 1603-1610. Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1858.

_____. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series of the Reign of James I. 1611-1618. Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1858.

_____. Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice and in other Libraries of Northern Italy, 1610-1613. Edited by H. F. Brown. London: Mackie and Co., 1905.

Raleigh, W. The Works of Sir Walter Raleigh. ed. T. Birch. 8 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1829.

Spedding, J., ed. The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon. 7 vols. London: Longmans, Green, etc., 1861-1874.

Weldon, A. The Court and Character of King James. London: [n.p.], 1650.

Wilson, A. The History of Great Britain, Being the Life and Reign of James I. London: [n.p.], 1653.

Winwood, R. Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I. Edited by E. Sawyer, 3 vols. London: [n.p.], 1725.

II. SECONDARY WORKS

A. Articles

Curtis, M. "The Hampton Court Conference and Its Aftermath." History 46 (1961), 1-12.

Elton, G. R. "A High Road to Civil War?" From the Renaissance to the Counter-Reformation: Essays in Honour of Garrett Mattingly. Edited by C. H. Carter. London: Cape, 1966.

Gardiner, S. R. "On Certain Letters of Diego Sarmiento de Acuna, Count of Gondomar, Giving an Account of the Affair of the Earl of Somerset, with Remarks on the Career of Somerset as a Public Man." Archaeologia xli (1867), 151-186.

Gruenfelder, J. K. "The Lord Wardens and Elections, 1604-1628." Journal of British Studies 15-16 (1975-1977), 1-23.

Harriss, G. L. "Medieval Doctrines in the Debates on Supply, 1610-1629." Faction and Parliament. Edited by K. Sharpe Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Jones, W. J. "The Crown and the Courts in England 1603-1625." The Reign of James VI and I. Edited by A. G. R. Smith. London: Macmillan, 1973.

Lee, M., Jr. "James VI's Government of Scotland after 1603." Scottish Historical Review 55 (1976), 41-53.

Loomie, A. "King James I's Catholic Consort." Huntington Library Quarterly 34 (1970-1971), 303-316.

MacCaffrey, W. "Place and Patronage in Elizabethan Politics." Elizabethan Government and Society: Essays Presented to Sir John Neale. eds. S. Bindoff, J. Hurstfield, C. H. Williams. London: Athlone Press, 1961.

Neale, J. "The Elizabethan Political Scene." Essays in Elizabethan History. J. Neale. London. Cape, 1958.

Owen, D. and Roberts, C. "The Parliamentary Undertaking of 1614." English Historical Review 93 (1979), 491-498.

Peck, L. L. "Problems in Jacobean Administration: Was Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, A Reformer?" Historical Journal 19 (1976), 831-858.

Prestwich, M. "English Politics and Administration 1603-1625." The Reign of James VI and I. Edited by A. G. R. Smith. London: Macmillan, 1973.

Rabb, T. "Sir Edwin Sandys and the Parliament of 1604." American Historical Review 69 (1964), 464-470.

Schwarz, M. "James I and the Historians: Toward a Reconsideration." Journal of British Studies 13-14 (1973-1975), 114-134.

Seddon, P. R. "Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset." Renaissance and Modern Studies 14 (1970), 48-68.

Smith, A. G. R. "Crown, Parliament and Finance: The Great Contract of 1610." The English Commonwealth, 1547-1640. eds. P. Clark, A. G. R. Smith, N. Tyacke. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1979.

Spedding, J. "Review of the Evidence Respecting the Conduct of King James I in the Case of Sir Thomas Overbury." Archaeologia xli (1867), 79-104.

Russell, C. "Parliamentary History in Perspective, 1604-1629." History 61 (1976).

Van Eerde, K. "The Spanish Match through an English Protestant's Eyes." Huntington Library Quarterly 32 (196801969), 59-75.

B. Books

Akrigg, G. Jacobean Pageant or The Court of King James I. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Amos, A. The Great Oyer of Poisoning: The Trial of the Earl of Somerset for the Poisoning of Sir Thomas Overbury, in the Tower of London. London: R. Bentley, 1846.

Ashton, R. The Crown and the Money Market, 1603-1640. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Aylmer, G. E. The King's Servants: The Civil Service of Charles I, 1625-1642. London: R. K. P., 1961.

Bell, H. E. An Introduction to the History and Records of the Court of Wards and Liveries. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Blatcher, M. The Court of King's Bench, 1450-1550: A Study in Self-Help. London: Athlone Press, 1978.

Carritt, E. A Calendar of British Taste from 1600 to 1800: Being a Museum of Specimens and Landmarks Chronologically Arranged. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1949.

Carter, C. H. The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625. London: Cape, 1964.

Chambers, E. The Elizabethan Stage. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.

Cokayne, G. E. The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom. Edited by G. White. 13 vols. London: The St. Catherine Press, 1959.

Coward, B. The Stuart Age: A History of England, 1603-1714. London: Longman Group Ltd., 1980.

Davies, D. W. Elizabethans Errant: The Strange Fortunes of Sir Thomas Sherley and His Three Sons. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967.

Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. 22 vols. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1908-1909.

Dietz, F. English Public Finance, 1485-1641. 2 vols. 2nd ed. London: F. Cass, 1964.

Ewald, A. Stories from the State Papers. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1882.

Ewen, C. A History of Surnames of the British Isles. London: John Gifford, 1931.

Foster, E. R., ed. Proceedings in Parliament 1610. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

Fraser, G. The Steel Bonnets: The Story of the Anglo-Scottish Border Reivers. London: Pan Books, 1974.

Friis, A. Alderman Cockayne's Project and the Cloth Trade: the Commercial Policy of England and its Main Aspects, 1603-1625. London: Oxford University Press, 1927.

Fuller, T. The Worthies of England. Edited by J. Freeman. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1952.

Gardiner, S. R. The History of England: From the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642. 10 vols. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1905.

Harrison, G. B. A Second Jacobean Journal: Being a Record of Those Things Most Talked of During the Years 1607 to 1610. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958.

Havran, M. Caroline Courtier: The Life of Lord Cottington. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1973.

Hill, C. The Century of Revolution. rev. ed. Toronto: Norton, 1981.

Higham, F. (Evans, F. M. G.) The Principle Secretary of State; A Survey of the Office from 1558-1680. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1923.

Hurstfield, J. Freedom, Corruption and Government in Elizabethan England. London: Cape, 1973.

Jack, S. Trade and Industry in Tudor and Stuart England. London: Allen and Unwin, 1977.

Judson, M. The Crisis of the Constitution: An Essay in Constitutional and Political Thought in England, 1603-1645. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1949.

Kenyon, J. P. Stuart England. London: St. Martin's Press, 1978.

Kynaston, D. The Secretary of State. Lavenham, Suffolk: Dalton, 1978.

Lacey, R. Sir Walter Raleigh. London: Cardinal, 1975.

Le Comte, E. The Notorious Lady Essex. New York: Dial Press, 1969.

Lloyd, R. Dorset Elizabethans, At Home and Abroad. London: J. Murray, 1967.

Loades, D. M. Politics and the Nation, 1450-1660: Obedience, Resistance and Public Order. London: Fontana, 1974.

Lockyer, R. Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592-1628. London: Longman, 1981.

MacCaffrey, W. The Shaping of the Elizabethan Regime: Elizabethan Politics, 1558-1572. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Mansell, W. An Historical and Genealogical Account of the Ancient Family of Maunsell-Mansell-Mansel. London: Privately printed, 1850.

Mathew, D. The Jacobean Age. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1938.

Matter, J. My Lords and Lady of Essex: Their State Trials. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1969.

Moir, T. L. The Addled Parliament of 1614. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Nichols, J. The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First. 4 vols. New York: Burt Franklin, 1828.

Notestein, W. The House of Commons, 1604-1610. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1971.

Osborn, L. The Life, Letters and Writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.

Parrot, T. M., ed. The Plays of George Chapman: The Tragedies. New York: Russell and Russell, 1961.

Powicke, Sir F. Maurice, and Fryde, E. B., eds. Handbook of British Chronology. 2nd ed. London: Royal Historical Society, 1961.

Prest, W. The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts. New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1972.

Prestwich, M. Cranfield: Politics and Profits Under the Early Stuarts. The Career of Lionel Cranfield, Earl of Middlesex. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

Pulman, M. B. The Elizabethan Privy Council in the Fifteen-Seventies. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971.

Rabb, T. K. Enterprise and Empire: Merchant and Gentry Investment in the Expansion of England, 1575-1630. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Rae, T. The Administration of the Scottish Frontier, 1515-1603. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966.

Rees, E. The Tragedies of George Chapman; Renaissance Ethics in Action. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Russell, C. The Crisis of Parliaments: English History, 1509-1660. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Sainty, J. Lieutenants of Counties, 1585-1642. London: Athlone Press, 1970.

Sanderson, W. A Compleat History of the Lives and Reigns of Mary Queen of Scotland, and of her Son and Successor, James the Sixth, King of Scotland. London: [n.p.], 1656.

Schreiber, R. E. The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton, 1589-1635. London: Royal Historical Society, 1981.

Sharpe, K. Sir Robert Cotton, 1586-1631: History and Politics in Early Modern England. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Shaw, W. The Knights of England: A Complete Record From The Earliest Time to the Present Day. 2 vols. Baltimore: Genealogical Pub. Co., 1971.

Smith, A. G. R. The Government of Elizabethan England. London: Edward Arnold, 1967.

Stone, L. The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Supple, B. E. Commercial Crisis and Change in England, 1600-1642: A Study in Instability of a Mercantile Economy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Tawney, R. H. Business and Politics under James I: Lionel Cranfield as Merchant and Minister. Cambridge: G. Unwin, 1958.

Trevelyan, G. England Under the Stuarts. 3rd. ed. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1960.

Turner, E. R. The Cabinate Council of England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, 1622-1784. Baltimore, 1930; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1970.

Watson, G. The Border Reivers. London: R. Hale, 1974.

Wedgwood, C. V. Truth and Opinion. London: Collins, 1960.

Williamson, J. The Myth of the Conqueror, Prince Henry Stuart: A Study of 17th Century Personation. New York: AMS Press, 1978.

Willson, D. H. King James VI and I. London: Cape, 1956.

_____. The Privy Councillors in the House of Commons, 1604-1629. New York: Octagon Books, 1971.

White, B. Cast of Ravens: The Strange Case of Sir Thomas Overbury. New York: George Braziller, 1965.